


• Ex Libris
Duquesne University:



A HARMONIZED EXPOSITION

OF THE

FOUR GOSPELS



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024

A HARMONIZED
EXPOSITION
OF THE
FOUR GOSPELS

BY
REV. A. E. BREEN, Ph. D., D. D.

AUTHOR OF
A GENERAL INTRODUCTION TO HOLY SCRIPTURE—
A DIARY OF MY LIFE IN THE HOLY LAND

VOLUME II
REVISED EDITION

"And this Gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in the whole inhabited earth for a testimony unto all the nations; and then shall the end come."—Matt. XXIV. 14

ROCHESTER, N. Y.
JOHN P. SMITH PRINTING COMPANY
1908

~~226.1~~

~~B832~~

~~V. 2.~~

Nihil obstat

J. Emil Gefelle Ph.D.

Censor Deputatus.

Imprimatur

Bernard;

Bishop of Rochester

BS2555

B65

1908x

vol 2

Rochester, N. Y., July 2, 1908.

CONTENTS

OF THE SECOND VOLUME

	PAGES
MATT. XII. 1—8; MARK II. 23—28; LUKE VI. 1—5.	
The plucking of the ears of corn on the Sabbath—Mercy and not Sacrifice—The Precedent of David - - -	1—21
MATT. XII. 9—14; MARK III. 1—6; LUKE VI. 6—11.	
The healing in the synagogue on the Sabbath of the man with the withered hand - - - - -	21—30
MATT. XII. 15—21; MARK III. 7—12.	
Jesus goes down to the Sea of Gennesaret—The fulfilment of Isaiah XLII. 1—4—The demons confess the Divinity of Jesus - - - - -	31—45
MATT. IX. 35—X. 4; MARK III. 13—19; LUKE VI. 12—16.	
Jesus goes about through the cities and villages teaching and healing—The calling of the twelve Apostles - - -	45—69
MATT. V. 1—10; LUKE VI. 17—21.	
The Beatitudes - - - - -	69—98
MATT. V. 11—16; LUKE VI. 22—26.	
Jesus proclaims the Apostles to be the Light of the world, and the Salt of the earth - - - - -	98—120
MATT. V. 13—16.	
Ye are the Salt of the Earth—The City set on a Hill - -	120—130
MATT. V. 17—20.	
The sanctity and eternity of the New Law—True Righteousness	130—138
MATT. V. 21—26.	
The sin of anger - - - - -	138—150
MATT. V. 27—32.	
The sin of lustful thoughts—The indissolubility of marriage, except in the case of adultery - - - - -	150—155

JUL 15 '32

9662

MATT. V. 33—37.	
The teaching of Jesus regarding oaths	155—161
MATT. V. 38—48; LUKE VI. 27—37.	
The love of enemies—The pardoning of offenses—The giving of alms	162—191
MATT. VI. 1—4.	
Alms to be done in secret	191—196
MATT. VI. 5—15.	
The proper mode of prayer—The Lord's Prayer	196—225
MATT. VI. 16—18.	
The doctrine of fasting	225—228
MATT. VI. 19—21.	
Christ teaches to lay up treasures in Heaven	228—233
MATT. VI. 22—23.	
The lamp of the body is the eye	233—235
MATT. VI. 24.	
Ye cannot serve God and Mammon	236—241
MATT. VI. 25—34.	
Be not anxious for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body what ye shall put on	241—256
MATT. VII. 1—6; LUKE VI. 37—42.	
The mote in the brother's eye—Cast not pearls before swine	256—270
MATT. VII. 7—11; LUKE XI. 5—13.	
Ask and ye shall receive	270—279
MATT. VII. 12—14.	
All things therefore whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, even so do ye also unto them—The narrow gate	280—284
MATT. VII. 15—23; LUKE VI. 43—46.	
The tree is known by its fruit	284—292
MATT. VII. 24—29; LUKE VI. 47—49.	
The house built upon the rock, and the house built upon the sand	293—296
MATT. VIII. 5—13; LUKE VII. 1—10.	
The healing of the Centurion's servant at Capharnaum	297—316
LUKE VII. 11—17.	
The widow's son at Naim is raised up from the dead	316—324
MATT. XI. 1—19; LUKE VII. 18—35.	
Jesus' testimony concerning John the Baptist	324—356
LUKE VII. 36—50.	
The sinful woman anoints the feet of Jesus in Simon the Pharisee's house—The parable of the two debtors—The woman is forgiven by Jesus	356—370
MATT. XIII. 1—23; MARK IV. 1—25; LUKE VIII. 1—18.	
The parable of the sower	370—407

MARK IV. 26—29.

The intrinsic power of growth of the kingdom of Heaven - 408—412

MATT. XIII. 24—43; MARK IV. 30—34.

The parable of the tares among the wheat—The parable of the mustard seed—The parable of the leaven - 412—432

MATT. XIII. 44—58; MARK VI. 1—6.

The parable of the treasure hidden in the field—The parable of the pearl of great price—The parable of the net—The judgment—The carpenter's Son—The prophet without honor in his own country - 432—449

MATT. XII. 46—50; MARK III. 31—35; LUKE VIII. 19—21.

The Mother of Christ, and his disciples come to see him - 449—455

MATT. VIII. 18, 23—27; MARK IV. 35—41; LUKE VIII. 22—25.

The stilling of the tempest - 455—465

MATT. VIII. 28—34; MARK V. 1—20; LUKE VIII. 26—39.

Jesus visits the country of the Gerasenes—He heals certain demoniacs - 465—478

MATT. IX. 18—26; MARK V. 21—43; LUKE VIII. 40—56.

The healing of the woman afflicted with the flow of blood—The raising to life of Jairus' daughter - 478—496

MATT. IX. 27—34.

The healing of two blind men, and of a demoniac - 496—500

MATT. X. 5—42; MARK VI. 7—13; LUKE IX. 1—6.

First mission of the twelve disciples - 500—534

MATT. XIV. 1—12; MARK VI. 14—29; LUKE IX. 7—9.

The beheading of John the Baptist - 534—544

MATT. XIV. 13—21; MARK VI. 30—44; LUKE IX. 10—17. JOHN VI. 1—13

The first multiplication of the loaves - 544—561

MATT. XIV. 22—36; MARK VI. 45—56; JOHN VI. 14—21.

Christ walks upon the waters—Peter goes to meet him - 561—573

JOHN VI. 22—47.

Christ the Bread of Life - 573—588

JOHN VI. 48—59.

The Eucharist - 588—614

JOHN VI. 60—71.

The Eucharist continued—Many of the disciples leave the following of Jesus - 614—623

MATT. XV. 1—20; MARK VII. 1—23.

Christ condemns the hypocrisy, and formalism of the Pharisees 623—643

MATT. XV. 21—28; MARK VII. 24—30.

The expulsion of the demon from the daughter of the Syro-Phœnician woman - 643—652

MATT. XV. 29—31; MARK VII. 31—37.

The healing of the dumb, of the maimed, of the lame, and of the
blind—Ephphatha - - - - - 652—660

MATT. XV. 32—39; MARK VIII. 1—10.

The second multiplication of the loaves - - - - - 660—666

MATT. XVI. 1—12; MARK VIII. 11—21.

Jesus and his disciples cross the Lake of Gennesaret, and the
disciples forget to take bread - - - - - 666—677

MARK VIII. 22—26.

The healing of the blind man at Bethsaida - - - - - 677—682

MATT. XVI. 13—20; MARK VIII. 27—30; LUKE IX. 18—21.

St. Peter confesses the Divinity of Jesus Christ at Cæsarea
Philippi—Christ founds his Church upon Peter - - - 682—717

An Exposition of the Four Gospels

MATT. XII. 1-8.

1. Ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ ἐπορεύθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοῖς σαββάτοις διὰ τῶν σπορίμων· οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἐπείνασαν καὶ ἤρξαντο τίλλειν στάχους καὶ ἐσθίειν.

2. Οἱ δὲ Φαρισαῖοι ἰδόντες εἶπον αὐτῷ· Ἰδοὺ οἱ μαθηταὶ σου ποιοῦσιν ὃ οὐκ ἔξεστιν ποιεῖν ἐν σαββάτῳ.

3. Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε τί ἐποίησεν ὁ Δαυεὶδ, ὅτε ἐπείνασεν καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ;

4. Πῶς εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προθέσεως ἔφαγεν, ὃ οὐκ ἔξδὸν ἦν αὐτῷ φαγεῖν οὐδὲ τοῖς μετ' αὐτοῦ, εἰ μὴ τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν μόνοις;

5. Ἡ οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε ἐν τῷ νόμῳ ὅτι τοῖς σάββασι οἱ ἱερεῖς ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τὸ σάββατον βεβηλοῦσιν καὶ ἀναίτιοί εἰσιν ;

6. Λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ὅτι τοῦ ἱεροῦ μετίζον ἐστὶν ὧδε.

7. Εἰ δὲ ἐγνώκατε τί ἐστὶν· Ἐλεος θέλω καὶ οὐ θυσίαν, οὐκ ἂν κατεδικάσατε τοὺς ἀναιτίους.

MARK II. 23-28.

23. Καὶ ἐγένετο αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς σάββασι διαπορεύεσθαι διὰ τῶν σπορίμων, καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἤρξαντο ὁδοποιεῖν τίλλοντες τοὺς στάχους.

24. Καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι ἔλεγον αὐτῷ· Ἴδε τί ποιοῦσιν τοῖς σάββασι, ὃ οὐκ ἔξεστιν;

25. Καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς· Οὐδέποτε ἀνέγνωτε τί ἐποίησεν Δαυεὶδ ὅτε χρεῖαν ἔσχεν καὶ ἐπείνασεν αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ;

26. Εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐπὶ Ἀβιάθαρ τοῦ Ἀρχιερέως, καὶ τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προθέσεως ἔφαγεν, οὓς οὐκ ἔξεστιν φαγεῖν εἰ μὴ τοὺς ἱερεῖς, καὶ ἔδωκεν καὶ τοῖς σὺν αὐτῷ οὖσιν;

27. Καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς· Τὸ σάββατον διὰ τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐγένετο, καὶ οὐχ ὁ ἄνθρωπος διὰ τὸ σάββατον.

(1)

8. Κύριος γάρ ἐστιν τοῦ σαββάτου ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

1. At that season Jesus went on the sabbath day through the cornfields; and his disciples were hungry, and began to pluck ears of corn, and to eat.

2. But the Pharisees, when they saw it, said unto him: Behold, thy disciples do that which is not lawful to do upon the sabbath.

3. But he said unto them: Have ye not read what David did, when he was hungry, and they that were with him?

4. How he entered into the house of God, and did eat the loaves of proposition, which it was not lawful for him to eat, neither for them that were with him, but only for the priests?

5. Or have ye not read in the law, how that on the sabbath day the priests in the temple profane the sabbath, and are guiltless?

6. But I say unto you: That a greater being than the temple is here.

7. But if ye had known what this meaneth: I desire mercy, and not sacrifice, ye would not have condemned the guiltless.

8. For the Son of man is lord of the sabbath.

28. Ὡστε Κύριός ἐστιν ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ τοῦ σαββάτου.

23. And it came to pass, that he was going on the sabbath day through the cornfields; and his disciples began, as they went, to pluck the ears of corn.

24. And the Pharisees said unto him: Behold, why do they on the sabbath day that which is not lawful?

25. And he said unto them: Did ye never read what David did, when he had need, and was hungry, he, and they that were with him?

26. How he entered into the house of God when Abiathar was high priest, and did eat the loaves of proposition, which it is not lawful to eat save for the priests, and gave also to them that were with him?

27. And he said unto them: The sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath:

28. So that the Son of man is lord even of the sabbath.

LUKE VI. 1-5.

1. Now it came to pass on the second first sabbath, that he was going through the corn-fields; and his disciples plucked the ears of corn, and did eat, rubbing them in their hands.

2. But certain of the Pharisees said: Why do ye that which is not lawful to do on the sabbath day?

3. And Jesus answering them said: Have ye not read even this, what David did, when he was hungry, he, and they that were with him?

4. How he entered into the house of God, and did take and eat the loaves of proposition, and gave also to them that were with him; which is not lawful to eat save for the priests alone?

5. And he said unto them: the Son of man is lord of the sabbath.

1. Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν σαββάτῳ (δευτεροπρώτῳ) διαπορεύεσθαι αὐτὸν διὰ σπορίμων, καὶ ἔτιλλον οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἤσθιον τοὺς στάχους, ψάχοντες ταῖς χερσίν.

2. Τινὲς δὲ τῶν Φαρισαίων εἶπον: Τί ποιεῖτε ὃ οὐκ ἔξεστιν τοῖς σαββάσιν;

3. Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς: Οὐδὲ τοῦτο ἀνέγνωτε, ὃ ἐποίησεν Δαυεὶδ, ὅτε ἐπείνασεν αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ;

4. Ὡς εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προθέσεως λαβὼν ἔφαγεν καὶ ἔδωκεν τοῖς μετ' αὐτοῦ, οὗς οὐκ ἔξεστιν φαγεῖν εἰ μὴ μόνους τοὺς ἱερεῖς;

5. Καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς: Κύριός ἐστιν τοῦ σαββάτου ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

In the second verse of Matthew C, D, L, Δ, 13, and 124 add αὐτούς. In the fourth verse, N and B have ἔφαγον. This is endorsed by Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort. C, D, and other authorities have the singular ἔφαγε. In the same verse, B, D, 13 and 124 have the singular relative ὃ. This is also found in many cursive MSS., and is approved by Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort. Many codices and versions have οὗς, in conformity with the texts of Mark and Luke.

In the sixth verse of Matthew, C, L, and Δ have μεῖζων, but the larger number of authorities have μεῖζον.

In the twenty-third verse of Mark we find the reading παραπορεύεσθαι in N, A, L, Γ, Δ, Π, et al. The other variants of Mark are unimportant.

In the first verse of Luke, **8**, B, L, et al. omit the reading *δευτεροπρώτῳ*. It is also rejected by the Coptic, Peshitto and Ethiopian versions. Westcott and Hort place the term in the margin. Wilke, Bleek, Holtzman, Volkmar, Meyer, Weiss and Tregelles reject it. Alford and Lachmann consider it doubtful. It is found, however, in the greatest number of codices, and is quite generally endorsed by the Fathers and by Tischendorf. In the second verse of Luke many codices add *ποιεῖν*.

In the fourth verse, B and D omit the initial *ὥς*. In the same verse, B, C*, L, X, et al. have *λαβόν*: the other authorities have *ἔλαβε καί*.

In the essentials of the fact the parallelism is clearly maintained, but every Evangelist has certain details proper to himself. One of these details is the designation of time in Luke. According to the aforesaid Evangelist, the event took place on the second-first Sabbath (*ἐν σαββάτῳ δευτεροπρώτῳ*). Such a designation of time is not found elsewhere in the Holy Scriptures. We can not know its exact import, and must limit ourselves to conjectures. The term is omitted in the codices of the Vatican, Mt. Sinai, in Codex Regius L of Paris, and in numerous minuscule codices; it is not found in the Coptic, Peshitto, Syriac and Ethiopian versions. The critics Westcott and Hort, though not rejecting the reading, place it in the margin. But by far the greater number of codices and authorities defend the reading. Weighing the critical data, we are led to the judgment that the obscurity of the word caused its omission from a certain number of codices; but its presence in so many others clearly proves that it was in the original of Luke. We believe therefore that the genuineness of the passage cannot be reasonably doubted. The data of tradition are so discrepant that it is profitless to review them. This truth is clear, that the text fixes the event on a certain Sabbath-day that was called second-first, on account of its relation to some starting point of enumeration. We shall be aided in determining the day by some notice of the Jewish feasts. It must have been at that time of the year when the harvest was ripening, but not yet gathered. Now the Hebrews began their sacred year with the Pasch. This began on the evening of the fourteenth day of the month called Abib. Abib means an ear of

corn; and the month was so named, because then the fruit-bearing part of the cereal plants appeared. After the Babylonian Captivity, this month was called Nisan. According to the Rabbis, it began on the new moon of March, and its duration was thirty days. Now the fifteenth day of this month was the greatest feast in the Jewish calendar. It was the Sabbath by excellence. On the evening preceding, the Paschal lamb was eaten, and the following day was solemn and holy; no servile work was to be done in it.—Levit. XXIII. 7. This was the *first-first* Sabbath, and all the subsequent feasts were fixed in reference to it. On the day following the great Sabbath of the fifteenth day of Abib, the Jews were bidden to present a sheaf of the firstfruits of the corn to the priest, who should offer it to the Lord by elevating it towards the four points of the compass. Now from this day, the Hebrews were bidden enumerate seven full weeks to the feast of the Pentecost, which was the second great feast in the Jewish calendar. It is called Pentecost, from the Greek Πεντηκοστή [*ἡμέρα*], *the fiftieth day*. In the Hebrew books of the Old Testament it is not called by that designation, but it is called the Feast of Weeks, since it occurred on the first day after a week of weeks after the Passover.—Exod. XXXIV. 22. It is also called the Feast of the Firstfruits of the Harvest, [Exod. XXIII. 16], because it was at the wheat harvest.

The third feast of importance in the religious polity of the Jews was the first day of the seventh month, called in Hebrew Tishri, corresponding to our month of September. This month is called by some the Sabbatical month, on account of the feasts occurring in it. The first day was a memorial feast celebrated with blowing of trumpets. It was scarcely of more solemnity than an ordinary Sabbath, servile work being prohibited therein, and a holocaust prescribed.—Leviticus XXIII. 24, 25. But in that same month, beginning with the evening of the ninth day, and lasting till the evening of the tenth day, was the solemn Day of Atonement. This was a day of great solemnity; servile work was prohibited, and every soul that did not afflict itself on that day lost its right to be counted in the people of the Lord.—Lev. XXIII. 27-32.

On the fifteenth day of this seventh month, or month of Tishri, began the Feast of Tabernacles, and lasted through eight days. The first day was a Sabbath of rest, and the eighth was also to be thus observed. All the produce of the fields was collected at this time, and the sacrifices were grander than at any other feast. They began the first day with a sacrifice of thirteen bullocks, two rams, fourteen yearling lambs, and a goat. The same number of rams and lambs, and the goat were sacrificed on every one of the seven consecutive days of the feast, but the bullocks were one less in number on every successive day; so that during the seven days seventy bullocks, fourteen rams, ninety-eight lambs, and seven goats were sacrificed. On the octave, one bullock, one ram, and seven lambs were sacrificed, and the day was a Sabbath of rest. These were the great Mosaic feasts of the Jews. Other feasts came in later, in commemoration of events in the subsequent history of the Jews, but of these we shall speak in their proper place. With these data before us, we think to see our way to a solution of this most difficult passage. We are fully convinced that the feast mentioned by St. Luke is called the second-first Sabbath in reference to the Great Sabbath of the Pasch, the first-first Sabbath. Now we saw that from the first Sabbath of the Pasch seven full weeks were to be counted till the Feast of the Tabernacles, which was to be celebrated the day following the seventh Sabbath. Ordinarily these Sabbaths intervening between the Passover and Pentecost would have been designated first, second, third, etc., even to the seventh; but this would conflict with the place and rank of the Paschal Sabbath, which was the first of all Sabbaths. Therefore did they call them the second-first [δευτεροπρώτον], second-second [δευτεροδεύτερον], second-third [δευτερότριτον], and so on down to the second seventh. The feast, therefore, mentioned by St. Luke is the first Sabbath following the Sabbath of the Passover, and was thus called because it was the first of a series; while at the same time, it was second in reference to the great Sabbath. This opinion has been adopted by Petavius, Pagi, Lamy, Calmet, Schanz, Joseph Scaliger, Casaubonus, Drusius, Lightfoot, Toynard, Schoettgen, Schleusner, Kuinoel, Schott, Neander, Luebkert, De Wette, Weiss, Wünsche, and Eder-

sheim. Knabenbauer pronounces no judgment on the passage. Maldonatus opposes the opinion, but we shall see that his opinion is based upon false data. He asserts that at that point of time no corn was ripe. This argument is immediately disproven by the fact that on the day following the great Sabbath of the Pasch, the first sheaf of the corn was offered by the priest in the temple. To be sure, at that date the harvest proper was not ripe. The wheat harvest was just fifty days later, at the Feast of Weeks, but on the day following the Pasch some certain cereal was mature, and of this the sheaf was taken to be offered in the temple. The great mistake of Maldonatus is to mistake this offering of the sheaf for the sacrifice of the firstfruits of the harvest at the Feast of Weeks. We are not merely conjecturing here. We have Scriptural proof for our assertion. In the sixteenth chapter of Deuteronomy, ninth verse, the date of numbering the seven weeks which separated the Passover from the Feast of Pentecost is spoken of as follows: "Begin to number the seven weeks from such time as thou beginnest to put the sickle to the corn." Now not even Maldonatus will deny that the seven weeks were counted from the Sabbath of the Pasch. Therefore at the Pasch they began to put the sickle to the corn. The corn could not be eaten in any form till the harvest had been thus solemnly opened by this sacrificial act.—Levit. XXIII. 15. The harvest of some of the earliest of the cereals began then, and the grain harvest was continued during the fifty days of the Pentecostal season. Of this early grain, the Apostles plucked some ears, and rubbing them in their hand, they ate the kernels. In the text of Mark, the phrase ἤρξαντο ὁδοποιεῖν has given rise to some strange opinions. To explain why Mark explicitly mentions the beginning of the action, Schanz and Meyer conjecture that the protest came from the Pharisees as soon as the action began. It is more probable that Mark wishes to note that the action was not a sudden movement of all the disciples. Hunger forced one or another of them to pluck an ear of the corn. They saw that the Master reproved them not, and others followed their example. Regarding the ὁδοποιεῖν the discussion has been greater. The first meaning of the term in the active voice is to make or level a road, *viam sternere*. Some have drawn from such

signification of the word that the disciples went before the Lord, and beat down the stubble, and removed the obstructions. Some rationalists have asserted that they went before him into the field of grain, and opened up a path by tearing out the grain. The absurdity of this position is apparent. The action would have been foolishly useless, attended with great labor, and unjust to the possessor of the field. The Pharisees could justly protest against such an action, and the Lord could not defend it. We conclude therefore that Mark uses the active voice of the *ὁδοποιεῖν* for the middle voice, in which the classic signification of the term is *iter facere*, to make one's way. In the uncial codices \aleph , A, L, Γ , Δ , Π , and several minuscule codices we find *παρὰπορεύεσθαι* instead of the *διαπορεύεσθαι* of the received text. *Παρὰπορεύεσθαι* has the meaning to pass along by the side of a thing; whereas *διαπορεύεσθαι* signifies to pass through the thing itself. It is probable that the Lord and his followers passed along a way which skirted fields of ripening grain; and that from the bordering grain the disciples plucked a few heads. The East was not, and is not to this day, a land of carriage roads. The largest centers of population were connected by mere camel paths, and the action of the disciples could have been done as they traveled over a path which passed through fields of grain.

Matthew tells us that the motive which impelled the disciples to pluck the ears of corn was hunger. Although the Lord imposed not on his followers the official fasts of the Pharisees, nevertheless, the present passage gives evidence that their lives were austere and poor, and that the service of the Master led them at times through want and hunger. Certainly it was not an ordinary degree of hunger that impelled them to appease the stomach's craving by the raw ears of corn.

In the text of Luke we read that the protest of the Pharisees was directed to the disciples themselves; while the other two synoptists record it as addressed to Jesus in person. The main truth of the event is not bound to these details. The Evangelists are concordant in the substance of the fact, and every detail also is true. The obvious sense of the parallel passage as relates to the address of the protest is that there were certain Pharisees in the company of Jesus and his dis-

ciples. These seeing the act of the disciples, immediately took issue with them regarding its legality. The future teachers of the world and pillars of the Church, at that period of their lives, were unable to cope with these wily sophists, and the Master always came to their defense with the enunciation of some grand truth, which stopped the mouths of the traducers, while it also taught the world the truth. What defense the disciples made on this occasion, is not written. It was unimportant. But then the sectaries come to Jesus, and lay before him the accusation. All the Evangelists have given his answer, because in that consisted the settlement of the whole issue. Of the preceding details, Luke only mentions the reproof made to the individual Apostles; the subsequent bringing of the accusation to the notice of the Lord he leaves to be inferred. The other two writers omit the preceding detail, and give only that which is most important, the protest to Jesus, and his answer.

The plucking of the heads of grain would not have been unlawful on any other day even by Pharisaic law. In Deuteronomy, XXIII. 24, 25, we read: "When thou comest into thy neighbor's vineyard, then thou mayest eat grapes, thy fill at thine own pleasure; but thou shalt not put any in thy vessel. When thou comest into the standing corn of thy neighbor, then thou mayest pluck the ears with thine hand; but thou shalt not move a sickle unto thy neighbor's standing corn." The law was too explicit here to permit of Pharisaic obscuratation. But they had loaded down the Sabbath with a dreary mass of absurd casuistry. And in all these wearisome details there was nothing of anything spiritual, nothing of the higher aim of the worship for which the day was made. We may come at the nature of Pharisaic thought through the Talmud. To be sure, in the days of Christ, the teachers of Israel may not have held the extreme views of the Talmudists, but still the Talmud is the embodiment of those results which Pharisaic thought finally accomplished. In Appendix XVII. to his II. Vol. of the Life of Christ, Edersheim has collected some curious data from the Talmuds respecting Sabbath observance.

In the Mishnic chapter on the Sabbath we are taught that if a beggar stretched forth his hand into the house of a householder, and took anything out, he was guilty of Sabbath-breaking, because he took something from a private into a public place. Whereas, if the person within the house drew thus an object into the house, the violation was not maintained, since the object was brought into a private place; the precept of maintaining rest being more strict in regard to public than private places. Upon this chapter, the Talmudists have written lengthy, spiritless discussions as to what constituted a private place; and they invented cunning devices for making public places private. A woman is forbidden in the Mishna to wear her ornaments on the Sabbath. A camel may not go forth wearing a bell, as it was reputed the carrying of a burden. A cow might not go forth with a strap about her horns. A sheep could not go forth having some grass in its mouth, since they considered the bite of grass in the sheep's mouth a burden, which the sheep could not carry on the Sabbath. The Mishna explains the principal works not permitted on the Sabbath. These they call the **אַבוֹת מְלָאכֹת**. They are thirty-nine in number. Among these is to break two threads, or to sew two stitches. Again, they judged it a Sabbath violation to carry as much hay or straw as a cow would take at a mouthful, or as much grain as a lamb would take at a mouthful. By the same law, a man might not carry a swallow of milk in a vase, or a smaller quantity of oil or honey on the Sabbath. He might not carry a strip of paper with writing on it. A man might not raise a stone to throw at a bird or beast. A man might not bear anything in either hand or upon his shoulder, since that was the ordinary mode of carrying burdens; but a man could carry a burden with his foot or his mouth or his ear, or his hair, or in his belt, or in his shoe, because this was not the ordinary mode of carrying burdens. A man might not write two letters that could be construed together, nor could he tie a knot in the cord with which he led the camel.

In the ordinances of the Mishna among the works forbidden on the Sabbath are the following: To lead an animal to water with his covering on; to kill vermin; to light a fire; to extinguish a light; to move a chair by dragging it; to

wear an easily removed ornament, as a necklace, a ring, or a pin; to pluck out a hair, or wear in public false hair; to wear shoes studded with nails; to go in public with false teeth or a gold plug in one's tooth; to tie a knot; to undo a knot; to take two stitches; to write two letters; to pluck a blade of grass, etc. No surgical operations might be performed, no bones set, and no remedies might be given to the sick which would benefit the sick, except that a woman might be assisted to give birth to her child. If a hen laid an egg on the Sabbath it was forbidden to eat it. No burden of the size of a dried fig might be carried. To reap the grain was one of the thirty-nine works which were forbidden on the Sabbath, and on this the Pharisees based their protest.

It was by design that the Lord placed these events on the Sabbath. The errors of the Pharisaic teaching reached their culminating point in the observance of the Lord's day, and the Lord made out of this the great test-case where the external ritualism of the old order and the spiritual worship of the New Law should meet and decide the great issue. The basis of the Lord's defense of the action of the disciples is that they were hungry, but in the defense, the principle is sustained that a reasonable necessity exempts from the observance of the positive precepts of God. Now in this regard, not all laws are equal. There are laws which a man may not break in whatsoever necessity, such as the laws of nature, or the law of God respecting the things which are intrinsically evil. Thus a man may not in any necessity take innocent life, or deny God, or blaspheme God's name, or commit adultery, or lie, or the like. There are other laws called positive laws, either divine or human, which admit of causes excusing from their observance. And one of such is the law of rest upon the Sabbath, the law of fasting, of abstinence and the like. Now in these laws there is verified this truth that, though a man be free from the law by necessity, still it is a greater act of religion to observe it even in the necessity. Thus severe labor forms a just cause for non-observance of the precept of fasting, still it is more religious to observe the precept, even in the necessity, provided it may be without injury to health, or prejudice to duties to be performed. But the Pharisees stood not for the law of perfection,

as thus explained. First, because they condemned an action as unlawful which necessity made licit; but principally, because they misinterpreted the end of the law, and made of it an end, whereas it should have been only a means. In their interpretation, the mind rested simply on the material observance, and consequently never reached upward to God. God repudiates every agency that keeps men from him, and the Pharisees' strict observance was odious to him, because it did not lead men to God.

As the Pharisees based their charge upon the statutes of the Law, the Lord refutes them by appealing to the well-known event in the life of David, and also to the command to the priests to sacrifice on the Sabbath. The Lord so couches his answer that it expresses surprise that these professedly zealous exponents of the Law should have been ignorant of the lesson contained in these Scriptural data. The first fact is narrated in the I. Book of Samuel, Chapter XXI, 1. When Saul sought the life of David he fled from the face of Saul, and came to Nob, where the Ark of the Covenant was then preserved. The text of Samuel declares that the priest at that time was Achimelech, and places the act of David entirely under Achimelech, whereas Mark refers it to the time of Abiathar the high priest. One of the sons of Achimelech was called Abiathar. When Saul slew Achimelech and his line for the help given David, Abiathar fled to David, and afterwards succeeded to the priesthood under David. The son also of Abiathar was called Achimelech, II. Sam. VIII. 17; I. Chron. XVIII. 6. This has led some to conjecture that all these individuals bore the two names Abiathar and Achimelech, and that the same individual is by Mark called Abiathar who is called Achimelech in I. Samuel. We prefer however the following solution. Abiathar played a considerable part in the history of David the king. He was much better known to the Jews than the obscure Achimelech. Now although at the time of David's flight to Nob, Achimelech, Abiathar's father, held the official post of priest, Abiathar was associated with him in the functions of the office, and most probably he was more active than the aged Achimelech. The fact therefore did occur in the days of Abiathar, and he could be called high priest, ἀρχιερεύς, in the same manner that

Annas and Caiphas are both called ἀρχιερεῖς by Luke. To justify the expression of Mark, "ἐπὶ Ἀβιάθαρ τοῦ ἀρχιερέως," we must believe that at the very time of David's coming to Nob, Abiathar was the high priest. Now we believe that this is rightly explained by making him high priest by association with his father. Though we hold this to be the more probable opinion, we must in justice to the theme give some notice to some other opinions. We can not consistently with faith entertain the opinion of Keil and Weiss who explain the antilogy by the supposition that through defect of memory Mark placed Abiathar for Achimelech. Schegg and Schanz believe that Mark relates the event as it was popularly understood by the Jews. The opinion of Schegg and Schanz would be in substance that from the subsequent priesthood of Abiathar under David, and from the fact that he fled from the slaughter of the priests who were slain by command of Saul, that a popular error arose, in which Achimelech was dropped out of the narrative, and the priesthood of Abiathar was extended back into the period of David's flight. They find no incongruity in assuming that the Lord corrected not this erroneous detail, for nothing depended thereon. To us, however, it seems repugnant to our conception of the Lord, and of divine inspiration.

Finally, it could perhaps be maintained as a probable opinion that there was at the time of David's flight one Abiathar holding the post of high priest, of whom no mention is found in the books of Samuel. In this opinion, Achimelech, who gave the bread to David, would be a subordinate priest exercising his functions under Abiathar. And likewise in this opinion, we know not in what degree of kinship Achimelech stood to Abiathar. Likewise the subsequent cutting off of the family of Achimelech and the escape of Abiathar, son of Achimelech, would have naught to do with the history of the high priest Abiathar. This opinion receives some corroboration from the fact that Achimelech is only called a priest in the books of Samuel; whereas Abiathar is by Mark called a high priest. The expression of Mark does not demand that Abiathar the high priest have any personal connection with the event. It simply locates the event in the epoch of his high

priesthood. We believe that this opinion is probable, and these several probable opinions vindicate Mark's narrative from the charge of historical inaccuracy.

For a clear understanding of the present passage we must examine the event in David's life which the Lord here cites. David fled in haste from Saul and came to Nob, to Achimelech the priest of God. And Achimelech wondered that he came alone. It was not usual that a man of David's dignity should journey without a retinue. Thereupon David withholds from Achimelech the real motive of his flight, and feigns that he is on secret business of the king, which suffered no delay, and which could not be communicated to any one. David has been accused of lying in his answer to Achimelech, but we believe no such charge can be proven against him. There was no wrongful deception of the priest; for he had no right to know that David fled from the face of Saul. The right that David had to food to sustain life and to security took precedence of the right which the priest would have in ordinary conversation to receive a statement of the facts.

From the fact that David came to Achimelech alone, a difficulty has arisen. The three evangelists speak of retainers being with David, who also ate of the holy bread. In examining the event of David's flight as chronicled for us in I. Samuel XX. and XXI., we find that he certainly appeared alone before Achimelech. We find, moreover, no indication of followers with David, except in his answer to Achimelech, I. Sam. XXI. 2: "And David said unto Achimelech the priest: The king has commanded me a business, and hath said unto me: Let no man know anything of the business about which I send thee, and what I have commanded thee. And I have stationed young men in certain appointed places." David has again been censured by commentators for this statement. But we justify him by the principle that we have adopted, that the essence of a lie is deception, and deception is not found in these cases. It was a prudent withholding of fact, which the other had no right to know, and the substitution therefor of matter which caused no evil to the person addressed. Hummelaur defends David's action on the principle of mental restriction. The Jesuit theologians first formulated this prin-

ciple, and it has been quite generally adopted by Catholic theologians. They arrive at the same results as we, but we believe that our principle appeals more to the natural instinct of truthfulness in man's nature. It is important for us to defend David's action from imputation of falsehood; else the proving force of the Lord's words is lost. If David obtained the loaves of the priest by lying, the Jews justly could have responded: "The authority of David avails not, for he also, in the same event, deceived the priest of God."

It must be borne in mind here that the Lord brings forth the action of David as an example of that which is lawful. The point is not that the priest gave him the bread. The priest is only connected with the event to designate the time. The Lord's line of argument is as follows: David was a man whom the Jews honored second to Abraham. His heart was according to the heart of the Lord, and the Lord protected his whole life by a most special providence. Now excepting the adultery with Bathsheba and the command to slay Uriah, the words and acts of David recorded in the Scripture are exemplary. The Scripture openly reprehends the great sin of David, but it speaks of his other acts and his words as of a man acting under the immediate influence of Heaven; and the eating of the loaves of proposition is so described in Scripture as to show us that it was the means which a special Providence made use of to feed his hunger. He was an inspired agent, and both his words and the important events of his life, written in Scripture, and bearing the implicit approbation of the writer of such Scripture, are for our instruction. Hence the Lord draws from it the legitimate conclusion that David's action is a precedent in the right application of the law. Now some have thought that David was in fact unattended, and that his mention of the servants stationed at certain posts was also an invention of his own mind. In such interpretation the words of the Lord would give us much difficulty; for he speaks of David's attendants being hungry and eating the holy bread. The whole argument falls flat if we say that David's attendants did not in reality exist. For thus the Lord would have erred in the substance of the fact, and a weighty element would be lost out of the narrative.

We believe that David drew with him a few trusty followers in his flight, and in order not to attract attention, as he went to the priest, he appointed them to different stated places, and went up to the priest alone. In fact, the quantity of bread asked for, five loaves, proves that he asked for bread for his followers. Moreover, the Lord makes a point of the fact that the retainers of David ate of the bread. In fact, if only David ate of it, one might weaken the Lord's citation by saying that David was an extraordinary man, the anointed of God, and though not a priest, still, by the sacred unction, taken out of the ranks of the common laity; so that not the necessity, but the exalted character of David entitled him to eat the holy bread. But when the Lord avouches that the common soldiers, whose lives are not always the best, ate of the holy bread, the argument became conclusive, that the necessity exempted them from the law.

The law respecting the holy bread of the temple is promulgated in Leviticus, XXIV. 5-9. The loaves were twelve in number, made of fine flour. Every loaf contained two-tenths of an epha, hence every loaf would have in itself somewhat more than six English pounds of flour. They were arranged in two piles, six in a pile on a table, two cubits long, a cubit in breadth, and a cubit and a half in height, made of precious wood and overlaid with gold. This bread is sometimes called in Hebrew **לֶחֶם פָּנִים**, the bread of the presence, because it was set before the face of the Lord.—Ex. XXV. 30; XXXV. 13; XXXIX. 36. In II. Chron. XIII. 11, it is called **מַעֲרֶכֶת לֶחֶם**, *ordo seu dispositio panis*, an ordering of the bread, because the mode of offering it was to arrange it in a stated manner before the Lord. In II. Chron. IV. 19, the Septuagint renders the **לֶחֶם פָּנִים**, *ἄρτοι προθέσεως*, *panes propositionis*, that is, bread arranged before the face of the Lord as an offering. This is the usual appellation of this sacrifice in the New Testament; hence the Catholic English version calls them the bread of proposition. The protestant versions, imitating the version of Luther, call them the shewbread. They could be called, bread of the presence.

The priests were commanded to arrange the bread on the table on the Sabbath, and to renew it every Sabbath. The loaves which had been removed, they were commanded to eat in the temple itself. It was this bread, thus removed to give place to the fresh loaves, that the priest gave to David.

In the fourth verse of the Greek of Matthew there is a variant in relation to the number of the verb which predicates of David the eating of the bread. The Vulgate has the verb in the singular, "*comedit.*" In this it follows the greater number of Greek authorities, which uniformly have *ἔφαγε*. The plural form *ἔφαγον* is found in the Vatican and Sinaitic codices and is defended by Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort. Knabenbauer also considers it the more probable reading. The chief argument for the plural reading seems to be that it was the intention of the Lord to affirm that the attendants also ate the bread. This proves nothing. From the fact that the hunger of the attendants is mentioned immediately before, and in the same verse mention is made of the prohibition against the eating of the bread by them, it is plainly implied by Matthew that they ate. As David went alone to the temple, the writer places the verb of going thither in the singular, and the construction would be harsh to place the next verb in the plural. Moreover both Mark and Luke have the verb in the singular. It is very probable that the Lord actually made mention of the eating of the bread by David, and of his giving it to his attendants, as Mark and Luke relate. Matthew has mentioned directly the first fact, and has left the giving of the bread to be inferred from the context. We cannot therefore consider the plural *ἔφαγον* as a probable reading. The second example cited by the Lord is more simple in its history. By the command of God to Moses, expressed in Numbers, XXVIII. 3-10, two sacrifices were offered on the Sabbath. First there was the perpetual daily sacrifice of one lamb and a tenth part of an epha of flour mingled with the fourth part of a hin of oil in the morning and the same in the evening. This never varied: it was the perpetual sacrifice. But on the Sabbath day, over and above this perpetual sacrifice, there was commanded a sacrifice of two yearling lambs and a proportionate quantity of flour and oil. Now all the necessary labor for offering the

sacrifice was done by the priests on the Sabbath. The victims were killed, and skinned, the flesh was cut up, the wood was placed on the fire, and the fire was maintained. In asserting that the priests thus violated the Sabbath, the Lord uses the word violate in its material sense, that is, that they did that which in other circumstances would have been a violation of the Sabbath rest. That the priests were without blame in this action is evident from the fact that the Lord commanded that which necessitated labor. It was a proof taken from their own law that the object of the Sabbath was something higher than the mere cessation from labor. The Sabbath rest was ordained to put man into a condition to worship God, and the great aim of the Sabbath was the worship of God, and all activity that promoted that aim was good and is good. In the same way the Sabbath rest stood not in the way of the high offices of mercy. God can never be pleased with mere forms and lifeless ceremony. He is God of truth, and looks into the essence of things; and it is the spirit of man that he would come into communication with. The universal and faithful observance of a Sabbath rest is good; it is a public recognition of a Supreme Being; it is a proper condition for worship. But higher than the condition, there is something which never changes, the eternal bond between God and man, brought into prominence by worship, and acts of mercy, and love of God and of the neighbor. The argument of Christ drawn from the action of the priests on the Sabbath is in substance as follows: "The Sabbath is to draw man to God; and the service of the temple, inasmuch as it is for God, justifies the activity necessary for the conducting of divine worship; but standing in this place, ὁ δεῖ, is a being greater than the temple. The temple is a mere material edifice of stone, and marble, and silver, and gold, wherein the majesty of the Lord is transiently shown, but I who stand here am the co-equal Son of that same Yahveh, whose glory at times fills the temple; and in me 'dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.'—Coloss. II. 9. Those who now pluck those ears of corn are hungry, because they have persevered with me, and the act is good, because it is connected with my service."

In the sixth verse of Matthew there is a variant. C, L, and Δ, have *μείζων*, the masculine form of the comparative. This is followed by the Vulgate, according to which we should render it: "But I say unto you that one greater than the temple is here." The greater number of codices have *μείζον*, the neuter comparative, according to which we should render the passage: "But I say unto you that a greater being than the temple is here." The latter is undoubtedly the true reading. Though the being indicated by such neuter form is Christ, such truth is more forcibly expressed in Greek by the neuter form. The other reading probably arose from the thought that the neuter form left the identity of Christ too indefinite.

The action of the disciples would have been lawful in hunger from whatever cause; it was doubly lawful from the fact that their necessity had come from their adhesion to the Lord. This whole argument of Christ is based on the truth that he was the Son of God. In all Christ's teachings, the grand truth of the divine Sonship of Christ remains a leading idea. It was the first act in the creation of the new universe, the basis of man's hold on the new life that opened up to him in Christ.

The conflict between the life of Christ and Pharisaic teaching centered on certain cardinal truths, so that in many events of his life the same truth is the point at issue. Hence, we find the Lord repeating certain truths to decide similar issues. The attitude of the Pharisees towards his disciples was against the grand quality of mercy, and he opposes to it the utterance of their own prophet Hosea, VI. 6: "I will have mercy and not sacrifice." This same sentence was uttered by Christ on a former occasion, Matt. IX. 13, when he was accused of consorting with sinners. In our exegesis of that event we have explained the sense of the prophet's words. Israel had become unfeeling towards God and towards man; the best things in man, mercy and love, were banished from their breasts. As land lying waste and untilled becomes wild and savage, so the heart of man, separated from the gentle influences of Heaven, becomes hard and cruel.

In the twenty-seventh verse, Mark alone has recorded a statement of the Lord, in which he condenses the main truth respecting Sabbath rest. The Sabbath is for man, and not man for the Sabbath. The error of Pharisaic teaching was to lose sight of the end for which the Sabbath was ordained, and to constitute the end of the Sabbath in the rest itself. They did not this expressly. In the Mishnic treatise *Mechilta* on Exodus, XXXI. 13, it is stated: "The Sabbath is handed over to you; not ye are handed over to the Sabbath." But the logical outcome of their teaching resulted in inverting the order, and in making man the means, and the Sabbath rest the end.

Catholic interpreters are unanimous in recognizing in the ordinance of Sabbath rest both a temporal and a spiritual end. The Sabbath is made for man that man might have a day of rest from his labor, that mind and body might put away pre-occupation and toil, and enjoy needful rest, and have time for the higher things of life. The wisdom of this beneficent design is evident in society. On that day, families are united, and weary toilers are allowed to enjoy the love and peace of their homes. The legislation of man should, as far as possible by human statute, preserve this God-given blessing of rest from the encroachment of human greed.

The second object of the Sabbath is the worshipful service of God, which the rest facilitates. This, of course, is the greater purpose of the Lord's day, and that activity which is ordered to promote this is good and holy. Nothing can ever take precedence of the worship on that day. There is nothing better than the service of God, but many causes may dispense from the rest from labor.

The three parallel passages close with the solemn affirmation of the Lord that he, in his incarnate form as Son of man, is Lord of the Sabbath.

The Lord loves to speak of himself as the Son of man. The greatest event in the history of man was when the Son of God became the Son of man. It was the opening of a new era, in which man was lifted from one plane of being into a higher and better world. The Lord keeps this truth in the foreground by frequently calling himself the Son of man.

It is lawful for a man to do what he will with his own. Therefore the Lord in virtue of being Lord of the Sabbath could modify or change at will the Sabbath ordinance. This truth alone would have justified the disciples. Jesus could only be Lord of the Sabbath by being equal in authority to God. No inferior can assert himself lord of the law of a superior. To be lord of any law, one must have equal or superior power to that of the original legislator. Hence in laying claim to dominion over Yahveh's statute, Christ again affirms his Divinity. Even one who receives not Christ must acknowledge that Christ proves his point in his discussion, and yet we find recorded no confession of the truth on the part of the Pharisees. It is a frightful example of human malice, that in all the grand expositions of truth and deeds of virtue recorded in the life of Jesus, we find no trace of any honest recognition of these on the part of the Pharisees.

MATT. XII. 9—14.

MARK III. 1—6.

9. Καὶ μεταβάς ἐκεῖθεν ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν αὐτῶν.

1. Καὶ εἰσῆλθεν πάλιν εἰς συναγωγὴν, καὶ ἦν ἐκεῖ ἄνθρωπος ἐξηραμμένην ἔχων τὴν χεῖρα.

10. Καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄνθρωπος χεῖρα ἔχων ξηράν. Καὶ ἐπηρώτησαν αὐτὸν λέγοντες: Εἰ ἔξεστιν τοῖς σάββασιν θεραπεύειν; ἵνα κατηγορήσωσιν αὐτοῦ.

2. Καὶ παρετήρουν αὐτὸν εἰ τοῖς σάββασιν θεραπεύσει αὐτὸν, ἵνα κατηγορήσωσιν αὐτοῦ.

11. Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς: Τίς ἔσται ἐξ ὑμῶν ἄνθρωπος ὃς ἔξει πρόβατον ἓν, καὶ ἐὰν ἐμπέσῃ τοῦτο τοῖς σάββασιν εἰς βόθυνον, οὐχὶ κρατήσῃ αὐτὸ καὶ ἐγερεῖ;

3. Καὶ λέγει τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τῷ τὴν χεῖρα ἔχοντι ξηράν: Ἐγείρε εἰς τὸ μέσον.

12. Πόσω οὖν διαφέρει ἄνθρωπος προβάτου; ὥστε ἔξεστιν τοῖς σάββασιν καλῶς ποιεῖν.

4. Καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς: Ἐξεστιν τοῖς σάββασιν ἀγαθοποιῆσαι, ἢ κακοποιῆσαι; ψυχὴν σῶσαι, ἢ ἀποκτεῖναι; οἱ δὲ ἐσιώπων.

13. Τότε λέγει τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ: Ἐκτεινόν σου τὴν χεῖρα. Καὶ ἐξέ-

5. Καὶ περιβλεψάμενος αὐτοὺς μετ' ὀργῆς, συλλυπούμενος ἐπὶ τῇ

τεινεν καὶ ἀπεκατεστάθη ὑγιής ὡς ἡ ἄλλη.

14. Ἐξελθόντες δὲ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι συμβούλιον ἔλαβον κατ' αὐτοῦ ὅπως αὐτὸν ἀπολέσωσιν.

9. And he departed thence, and went into their synagogue:

10. And behold, a man having a withered hand. And they asked him, saying: Is it lawful to heal on the Sabbath day? that they might accuse him.

11. And he said unto them: What man shall there be of you, that shall have one sheep, and if this fall into a pit on the Sabbath day, will he not lay hold on it, and lift it out?

12. How much then is a man of more value than a sheep! Wherefore it is lawful to do good on the Sabbath day.

13. Then saith he to the man: Stretch forth thy hand. And he stretched it forth; and it was restored whole, as the other.

παρώσει τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν, λέγει τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ: Ἐκτεινον τὴν χεῖρα. Καὶ ἐξέτεινεν καὶ ἀπεκατεστάθη ἡ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ.

6. Καὶ ἐξελθόντες οἱ Φαρισαῖοι εὐθὺς μετὰ τῶν Ἑρωδιανῶν συμβούλιον ἐδίδουν κατ' αὐτοῦ, ὅπως αὐτὸν ἀπολέσωσιν.

1. And he entered again into the synagogue; and there was a man there who had his hand withered.

2. And they watched him, whether he would heal him on the Sabbath day; that they might accuse him.

3. And he saith unto the man that had his hand withered: Arise *and stand forth* in the midst.

4. And he saith unto them: Is it lawful on the Sabbath day to do good, or to do harm? to save a life, or to kill? But they held their peace.

5. And when he had looked round about on them with anger, being grieved at the hardening of their heart, he saith unto the man: Stretch forth thy hand. And he stretched it forth: and his hand was restored.

14. But the Pharisees went out, and took counsel against him, how they might destroy him.

6. And the Pharisees went out, and straightway with the Herodians took counsel against him, how they might destroy him.

LUKE VI. 6—11.

6. And it came to pass on another Sabbath, that he entered into the synagogue and taught: and there was a man there, and his right hand was withered.

6. Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν ἐτέρῳ σαββάτῳ εἰσελθεῖν αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν καὶ διδάσκειν, καὶ ἦν ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖ καὶ ἡ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ ἡ δεξιὰ ἦν ξηρά.

7. And the scribes and the Pharisees watched him, whether he would heal on the Sabbath; that they might find how to accuse him.

7. Παρατηροῦντο δὲ αὐτὸν οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι, εἰ ἐν τῷ σαββάτῳ θεραπεύσει, ἵνα εὕρωσι κατηγορεῖν αὐτοῦ.

8. But he knew their thoughts; and he said to the man that had his hand withered: Rise up, and stand forth in the midst. And he arose and stood forth.

8. Αὐτὸς δὲ ᾔδει τοὺς διαλογισμοὺς αὐτῶν, εἶπεν δὲ τῷ ἀνδρὶ τῷ ξηρὰν ἔχοντι τὴν χεῖρα: Ἐγείρε καὶ στήθι εἰς τὸ μέσον, καὶ ἀναστὰς ἕστη.

9. And Jesus said unto them: I ask you: Is it lawful on the Sabbath to do good, or to do harm? to save a life, or to destroy it?

9. Εἶπεν δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς πρὸς αὐτούς: Ἐπερωτῶ ὑμᾶς, εἰ ἔξεστιν τῷ σαββάτῳ ἀγαθοποιῆσαι ἢ κακοποιῆσαι, ψυχὴν σῶσαι ἢ ἀπολέσαι;

10. And he looked round about on them all, and said unto him: Stretch forth thy hand. And he did so: and his hand was restored.

10. Καὶ περιβλεψάμενος πάντας αὐτούς, εἶπεν αὐτῷ: Ἔκτεινον τὴν χεῖρά σου: ὁ δὲ ἐποίησεν καὶ ἀπεκατεστάθη ἡ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ.

11. But they were filled with madness; and communed one with another what they might do to Jesus.

11. Αὐτοὶ δὲ ἐπλήσθησαν ἀνοίας καὶ διελάλουν πρὸς ἀλλήλους, τί ἂν ποιήσαιεν τῷ Ἰησοῦ.

The general plan of Jesus' teaching was to visit the synagogues on the Sabbath, and there teach the people. How long after the event of the plucking of the ears of corn till this second Sabbath scene, we can not say. The extremely accurate St. Luke informs us that it was on a following Sabbath, and that Jesus had entered the synagogue to teach. And there was in the synagogue a man with a withered hand. St. Luke also informs us that it was his right hand, by which the need of the man, and the greatness of the benefit are emphasized. The presence of the man in the synagogue has been variously explained. Some have thought it was a concocted move on the part of the Pharisees to provoke Jesus to an act whence they might bring charges against him of Sabbath-breaking. The preceding fact of the plucking of the ears of corn was not satisfactory to them, because Jesus was not directly implicated. They cared nothing for his band of followers, well knowing that the disciples' influence was nothing, without their head. They now plot and devise means to obtain some direct act upon which to impeach Jesus. Others maintain that the man came thither without any special design, but only in compliance with the religious observance of his people. No decisive opinion can be given in this matter.

The malady of the man's right hand was paralysis of the nerve power, and the member had become withered and lifeless. Mark and Luke say naught of any question addressed to Jesus on the legality of healing on the Sabbath, but only of a fixing of their observation upon him. But Matthew explicitly declares that they addressed to Jesus a direct question. We may picture to ourselves the scene in the synagogue. Christ is in a conspicuous place, and the gaze of all is upon him. Near by is the man with the withered hand. Then eagerly bending forward are the dark, repulsive faces of the Pharisees, expressive of falseness, malice, and cunning. They draw attention to the withered hand; and, taking occasion thence, they interrogate the Lord whether in general the principle could be defended that it is lawful to heal on the Sabbath. Their motive was not to know the truth of the issue, but to commit Christ to some word or deed which could be produced in evidence of Sabbath-breaking. The Rabbinic teaching on Sabbath-healing

is not very clear. In the Mishnic treatise on the Sabbath, Chap. XIV. 4, it is stated that one suffering from the toothache might not take into them a little vinegar on the Sabbath, as this was to employ the vinegar as medicine, but one might swallow a morsel of bread dipped in vinegar, as this was an act of eating, and if the healing happened *per accidens*, it was not a violation of the Sabbath. Neither could a man bathe his members with wine and vinegar in disease, but only with the oil of roses. Some of the later Talmudists have defended that, in danger of death, it was allowable to apply remedies on the Sabbath, but whether such modification existed in the time of Christ or not, can not be stated with certainty.

In the Gospel of Jesus Christ, we ever find a grand contrast between good and evil, truth and falseness; Christ stands for good and truth, and his opponents for the opposites; and one grand effect of the reading is to make us love the good and do it.

By his divine power of comprehension of the thoughts of man's soul, Christ knew the secret motives of the Pharisees' question. St. Luke alone calls attention to this fact. It is one of the arguments for the Divinity of Christ, much valued by Luke. We have never doubted this truth, but the mere admission of the truth is not sufficient to draw from the truth all that it means to us. In the present narrative, its force is to prove that Christ was God; to us in our daily lives, it imports that the true judge of our lives and our work is Christ. The perpetual realization that Christ is looking in upon our soul, and taking note of all its thoughts, impulses, and feelings, should establish a close union between Christ and us; it should move us to try to create something there that he could judge good.

In Christ's relations with the Pharisees, we find an admirable prudence, which effected that their unholy purposes always defeated themselves, and recoiled on the authors. He would finish his work, instruct his school, and found his Church, before he would deliver himself up to them. Up to the time when he consented to be delivered up, in his conflict with them, there is evident on his side the mighty power of God, and on their side the helplessness of evil battling against the power of God.

Knowing that their purposes were evil, the Lord responds not directly, but shows forth the truth of the issue by two questions, so formulated that no obscurity remains as to his teaching; while the Pharisees remained baffled in their attempt to obtain from him a statement that might be used against him.

The Lord turns to the afflicted man, and bids him stand forth in the midst, that all might see and judge of that which was done. Then turning to them, with the noble courage of a man who stood for truth, he reduces to silence his opponents by the power of his sublime teaching. The man is standing in the midst, and Jesus probably has arisen, and he addresses to them the question: "Is it lawful to do good on the Sabbath days, or to do evil? To save life or to kill?"

It is ever characteristic of falsehood to shirk a direct meeting with an issue. It will shuffle, and hedge, and maintain a non-committal silence. Truth cowers from no man's gaze, fears no man's questioning. From the consciousness of their falseness and evil purposes, they were timid, fearing that they would be forced to an admission of the truth. Hence they held their peace. There are natures so unjust and mean, that the greater and nobler a man is, the more bitter becomes their opposition to him. So it was with the Pharisees. The mighty power of the truths of Jesus' teaching, and the sublime goodness of his character only intensified the Pharisees' envy and hatred of him.

It is not easy to come at the specific import of the Lord's first question, or to determine its appositeness to the theme in question. Certainly it is not lawful on the Lord's Day to do all work which could be denominated good. It is a good work to build a church, or asylum for the poor, or for the fatherless child; but this would not justify one to set aside the Sabbath, when engaged in such enterprises. It is good to procure food and other necessities for the dependent portion of society; but in ordinary cases, these works should be set aside on the Sabbath. The good therefore of which the Lord speaks is the present alleviation of human misery, the showing of mercy in distress. This was the good which he wrought for the man with the withered hand. This is always good; it is one of the grandest elements in the soul of man. Every means, not

intrinsically evil, is good when ordered thereto. A man may be oblivious of systems of set rules, and positive precepts, when engaged in a work of mercy. The Saviour's argument was conclusive. God esteems love and mercy first of all man can do; therefore he could not prohibit these for a mere ordinance which he prized much less.

More obscurity exists in the other horn of the dilemma. The omission of good is not always the commission of evil. Had Christ refused to heal this man, it would not, in itself considered, have been evil; but had he refrained from healing him from their principle, that such an act of mercy were forbidden on the Sabbath, it would have been evil; because it would have dishonored God by eliminating from his law its soul, and substituting therefor a mere ritual observance.

The Lord next shows them the unreasonableness of their position, by comparing their attitude towards man with their attitude towards the beast. Whatever be the subsequent teaching of the Rabbis on this subject, it is certain that Christ appealed to a fact, when he said that, if a man's beast were in danger of death on the Sabbath, they would take measures to take it out of such danger on the Sabbath. It was a second proof that their teaching was inconsistent, hard, and without mercy. They would relieve the beast, because their property-interests were affected. They cared naught to relieve human misery, because no selfish interest was subserved thereby. And throughout the history of mankind, it is verified that human life is cheapened by the greed of getting. Again, the falseness of their sophistry is well brought out by this homely example. They were willing to indulge in these vain theories for others, but they never allowed the conclusion to touch them in their possessions. But with the Lord it was otherwise. He had no interest on earth save the souls of men. The stricken man was his sheep, and in need. He was Christ's property, and Christ took away his affliction on the Sabbath. No one ever set such a high value on human life as Christ. He saw all that there was in human life; he knew his Father's love for man; and he himself loved man with a love beyond human comprehension. He saw the high destiny to which man had been elevated; he set the right value on immortal souls. From the fact that

the Saviour here speaks of one sheep, *πρόβατον ἓν*, some have ordered the argument thus: If a man has but one sheep, he could be presumed to be more solicitous for this sole possession than if he had many; and therefore he would move more readily to its rescue on the Sabbath. This is plainly erroneous. The Lord takes the one sheep, in order to show how slight a property-consideration moved them to dispense with the strict rest of the Sabbath. It required not a flock of sheep to form, in practical life, a dispensing cause from the Sabbath law; one solitary sheep sufficed; and yet they forbade to show mercy to suffering man on that day. One reason why their sophistry on the Sabbath ordinance was so displeasing to Jesus was that they forbade mercy in the name of his Father's law.

The argument of Christ seems at first sight to admit of an exception. Could not the Pharisees have responded: "The sheep is in danger of death; and if the man were in similar danger, it were lawful to move to his rescue; but it is not so. It is not necessary that this chronic disability should be healed to-day." But the plan of Christ's argument is not so. It is as follows: The law of the Sabbath cedes to a consideration of the value of one sheep's life. Could God hold the value of a member of the human body cheaper than the life of a sheep? In his action and in his teaching, Christ has here established the principle of action for all men in similar issues. Mercy takes precedence of all the positive precepts of God. All the legislation of God tends towards the grand scope of worshipful love and absolute trust in God, and tender merciful love of the neighbor.

The Lord finished speaking, and paused for an answer. The assemblage was mute. They could not deny what he had said; and dishonesty and envy prevented them from acknowledging the truth. The eyes of the Lord passed from face to face, looking for some answer to his question: "—he looked about upon them all." He saw the hardness of their hearts, which resisted the clearest demonstrations of truth and the grandest evidences of goodness. A feeling of noble anger surged up in his soul, and was reflected in his face. It was the anger of God against sin. It was accompanied by a feeling of deep pain and sorrow that the creatures whom he had come to

redeem were so base and false. Thus does the Lord always regard man and his sins. An infinite eternal hatred exists between God and that which is evil; but his love for his creature endures even through sin; and God is always unwilling to lose a human soul.

The mystery of human incredulity is the saddest element in the history of man. Physical pain, distress, disease, poverty, and every other ill lose their terrors when relieved by faith, hope, and love. But when a man obstinately repels the truth, hardens his heart, settles down and walls himself around in the midst of his errors and misery, and from out a barren, cheerless existence looks forward to a blank, the spectacle is dreadful. This was a motive of deep sorrow for the Redeemer. This incredulous tenor of life generates a hard, selfish, defiant temper of mind. The potentiality of good in the man is not developed, the life is never lighted up by the light of supernatural hope, the man becomes afraid of his thoughts, and in terror recalls the mind from any meditation on death, and eternity. And so the life drifts aimlessly on, till the deadening of sensation modifies the terrors of a hopeless death. And yet this is the state of very many of the children of men.

St. Matthew informs us that the answer which the Pharisees were unwilling to give, the Lord pronounced himself: "It is lawful to do good on the Sabbath." The Sabbath is a day set apart for God; and certainly it is lawful thereon to do that which God prizes above all other human acts. Then Jesus turned to the stricken man, and said: "Stretch forth thy hand." And he stretched it forth, and it was made whole like as the other. The healing preceded the stretching forth; or rather, as the man's will moved the *actus imperatus*, the power of Jesus gave to the withered member the energy to obey the act of the will; so that the very stretching forth of the member was the evidence of its healing. The Lord had confirmed his teaching by the actual showing of mercy; and yet he had not broken the Sabbath, even in their mode of observance. He had employed no remedy, nor touch, nor outward application; but had healed the man, as God called the universe into being by his word. Their stupid casuistry had not contemplated formulating rules respecting the activity which operated as doth the power of God.

The Pharisees were confounded in everything. The sublime truth of his teaching, the clear evidence of his power confounded them, but produced no conviction. Baffled rage and a wild thirst for Jesus' blood took possession of them, and they straightway took counsel against him how they might destroy him. So wild was their fury that Luke calls it *ἄνοια*, *madness*. The intensity of their hate was proportioned to their discomfiture, and that had been great.

There was in Palestine at this epoch many different parties. Formerly their platforms had only differed in religious issues; but, since the cessation of Jewish autonomy, political issues had entered into the different schools, and, in fact, had formed new parties. One of this latter class was the party of the Herodians. It is not evident that they were differentiated by any distinctive religious principles; but in political life they stood for the Herodian dynasty and for the supremacy of Rome. No people complacently accepts the domination of a foreigner. And in no people in the history of man was the nationalistic tendency stronger than in the Jew. Their natural innate instinct towards self-government had been developed by their peculiar institutions, and by that division that existed between them and the Gentile nations. They were unquiet in their vassalage to Rome, and the national aspiration of their hearts was not crushed even by the destruction of Jerusalem. It remains in the Jew even to-day, and he looks forward to the restoration of Israel. This was one of the things that stood in the Messiah's way; he promised nothing to this wild longing, and they repulsed him and his promises in which they had no interest. Now the family of Herod had naught in common with this Jewish love of country. It was a foreign dynasty, kept in power by flattering and bribing the power of Rome. But money and power will always create for a man adherents, and so the Herodian dynasty had its political party called Herodians. They were powerful, not from their numerical strength, but because they had back of them the power of the state. Of course, these were detested by every true Jew. Neither was there anything in common between them and the Pharisees; but still so strong was the hatred against Jesus, that they were willing to invoke the aid of this party to crush him.

MATT. XII. 15—21

MARK III. 7—12.

15. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς γνοὺς ἀνεχώρησεν ἐκεῖθεν καὶ ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ πολλοὶ καὶ ἐθεράπευσεν αὐτοὺς πάντας.

16. Καὶ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς ἵνα μὴ φανερὸν αὐτὸν ποιήσωσιν:

17. Ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ ρηθὲν διὰ Ἡσαίου τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος:

18. Ἴδοὺ ὁ παῖς μου, ὃν ἠρέτισα, ὁ ἀγαπητός μου ὃν εὐδόκησεν ἡ ψυχὴ μου: θήσω τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπ' αὐτὸν καὶ κρίσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἐπαγγελεῖ.

19. Οὐκ ἐρίσει οὐδὲ κραυγάζει, οὐδὲ ἀκούσει τις ἐν ταῖς πλατείαις τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ.

20. Κάλαμον συντετριμμένον οὐ κατεάξει καὶ λίνον τυφόμενον οὐ σθέσει, ἕως ἂν ἐκβάλῃ εἰς νίκος τὴν κρίσιν.

21. Καὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ ἔθνη ἐλπιούσιν.

15. And Jesus perceiving it withdrew from thence: and many followed him; and he healed them all,

16. And charged them that they should not make him known:

17. That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Isaiah the prophet, saying:

7. Καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ ἀνεχώρησεν πρὸς τὴν θάλασσαν, καὶ πολὺ πλῆθος ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἠκολούθησεν, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας.

8. Καὶ ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰδουμαίας, καὶ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου καὶ περὶ Τύρον καὶ Σιδῶνα πλῆθος πολὺ, ἀκούοντες ὅσα ποιεῖ, ἦλθον πρὸς αὐτόν.

9. Καὶ εἶπεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ ἵνα πλοιάρια προσκαρτερῇ αὐτῷ, διὰ τὸν ὄχλον, ἵνα μὴ θλίδωσιν αὐτόν.

10. Πολλοὺς γὰρ ἐθεράπευσεν, ὥστε ἐπιπίπτειν αὐτῷ, ἵνα αὐτοῦ ἅψωνται, ὅσοι εἶχον μᾶστιγας.

11. Καὶ τὰ πνεύματα τὰ ἀκάθαρτα, ὅταν αὐτὸν ἐθεώρουν προσέπιπτον αὐτῷ, καὶ ἔκραζον λέγοντα, ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ.

12. Καὶ πολλὰ ἐπέτιμα αὐτοῖς ἵνα μὴ αὐτὸν φανερὸν ποιήσωσιν.

7. And Jesus with his disciples withdrew to the sea: and a great multitude from Galilee followed: and from Judæa,

8. And from Jerusalem, and from Idumea, and beyond Jordan, and about Tyre and Sidon, a great multitude, hearing what great things he did, came unto him.

18. Behold, my servant whom I have chosen; my beloved in whom my soul is well pleased: I will put my spirit upon him, and he shall declare judgment to the Gentiles.

19. He shall not strive, nor cry aloud; neither shall any one hear his voice in the streets.

20. A bruised reed shall he not break, and smoking flax shall he not quench, till he send forth judgment unto victory.

21. And in his name shall the Gentiles hope.

9. And he spoke to his disciples, that a little boat should wait on him because of the crowd, lest they should throng him:

10. For he had healed many insomuch that as many as had plagues pressed upon him that they might touch him.

11. And the unclean spirits, whensoever they beheld him, fell down before him, and cried, saying: Thou art the Son of God.

12. And he charged them much that they should not make him known.

A slight variant occurs in the fifteenth verse of Matthew, where many codices have ὄχλοι πολλοί. **N** and B omit the ὄχλοι. **N**, B, C and D, introduce the seventeenth verse by ἵνα: the other authorities employ ὅπως. We find δὲ εὐδόκησεν in the eighteenth verse in **N***, A, 115, and 244; many other authorities have εἰς δὲ.

In the seventh verse of the text of Mark, ἡκολούθησεν is placed after Γαλιλαίας in A, B, L, P, Γ, Π, et al. Such is the order also of the Coptic, Syriac and Gothic versions. It is after Ἰουδαίας in A, C, Δ, and 238. Such order of the words is also followed by the Vulgate, and is approved by Tischendorf. In the eight verse many authorities insert the plural οἱ before πέραν. In the same verse we find the reading ἀκούσαντες in many authorities; but we find ἀκούοντες in **N**, B and Δ. The Vulgate, Coptic, Ethiopic, and Gothic versions follow the latter reading, and it has the endorsement of Tischendorf.

Knowing that the Herodians would move Herod Antipas to seize him, the Lord withdrew from the centers of population, and went with his disciples down by the Sea of Gennesaret.

As the hour was not come for him to be delivered up, he prudently withdrew from danger; for rashly to court danger is not zeal nor fortitude. The elements were finely blended in Christ; he had all the virtues in an absolutely perfect proportion.

The multitudes which assembled about Jesus by the sea are here divided into two classes. First, there were many from Galilee and from Judæa, who actually followed him down to the sea. Many of these had been witnesses of his miracles, had heard his words, and perhaps some had even received benefits from him. Then there were others who, hearing of his fame, which was now spread abroad through the land, and hearing that he had retreated to the sea, they journeyed thither from Jerusalem, from Idumea, from Perea across the Jordan, and from the coast cities of Tyre and Sidon. Thus it results that a vast multitude from all points of the compass flocked thither to see the great works of Jesus. Although Jerusalem was a city of Judæa, still its importance entitled it to a particular mention in the enumeration.

The Idumeans were descended from Esau, who from his color was called אֲדוּמִים, *the red*. They originally dwelt along the transjordanic belt opposite to the inheritance of Jacob. By one of those migratory movements, common in ancient history, a portion of this race fixed their abode on the extreme southern limits of Judæa in the tribe of Simeon, and from them this territory was called Idumea. Herod the Great was of this region and race. Although originally not included in the Jewish people, they had been subjugated by Hyrcanus, son of Simon of the Maccabean family [† about 106 B. C.]. They accepted, as a condition upon which they might retain their lands, that they should become circumcised, and embrace the other Jewish institutions. Representatives of this people came to visit Jesus at the Sea of Gennesaret.

The motives that drew the vast assemblage together were by no means supernatural. They were led by their senses. Man is ever eager to lay down his load of bodily suffering; and some of the multitude came to be healed. Man will eagerly press forward through difficulty, toil, and danger to receive

something that will better his wordly interests. Rarely is such activity shown in the pilgrim's progress towards Heaven. Man is more eager to escape from the ills of the body than from the ills of the soul; he would rather throw off bodily disease than sin. In our days men have found a land of gold in a far off, frozen land. To reach it man must pass over mountain trails, through snow and ice. Death is in the way, men are starving and freezing to death away from home and country in that strange wild land. But, there is gold there, and the eager multitudes press on, drawn by the powerful motive of temporal gain. And beyond the horizon of mortal life lies a land better than gold, and he who loses his life in the effort to reach that land shall find it again; man's wealth in that land is proportioned to the hunger and thirst of the soul, and the greatness of the endeavor to attain it; and yet it is a busy age, but how little of the world's thought and the world's work is bent on seeking the kingdom of God? We are continually complaining of hard times, of scarcity of employment, of the conditions of man's status in this world. Is anybody thinking, or writing, or troubling himself about the low status of the faith of the world? of the scarcity of goodness, and of worship of God in spirit and in truth? Every man knows that he will not live here forever; but by far the greater number of men live just as if they were to live here always.

And so a great gathering assembled about Christ by the sea, not because he taught them of Heaven, of Redemption, of the love of God; but because he bettered their earthly lot. And Christ took that which was human and weak, and raised it to that which was divine. He healed every infirmity, and drove out the demons; thereby to draw the people to have faith in him, so that he might teach them wherein consist man's destiny and his duty. The Lord was away from the Pharisees, and among the people. His great heart was moved by their ignorance of God and by their misery. He gave free scope to his healing power, and those who touched him were healed. But at times the press became so great that it became dangerous. We find in the life of Jesus that he acted as a man, whenever human agency would accomplish the desired effects. He never appealed to his divine power, except where its exercise was

needed to promote good. So here he takes a human precaution. He bade the disciples have ready at hand a boat, so that, when the press was too great, he might withdraw into the boat. The mode of expression shows that it was not only for once that the boat was to be held in readiness, but that it was a continued precaution. The whole narration shows the greatness of his fame, the greatness and veracity of his miracles, and the clearness of the evidence that he was the Son of God. The Evangelist Mark lays especial stress on the healing of the demoniacs. He was writing for the Gentile world, and the power of Jesus was aptly proven to his hearers by the fact that Jesus was supreme over the demons.

The confession of the demons here forms a clear testimony of the Divinity of Jesus. It was not uttered through any reverence for Jesus, or wish to benefit him. It was a wild burst of demoniacal fury and terror, wrung from those spirits of evil, as they crouched in abject fear before the recognized power of Jesus. They had no wish to strengthen the proofs of Christ's Divinity; but awe and fear forced from them this wild cry, which by the high providence of God defeated Satan's purposes, and promoted the cause of Jesus. It is evident that when the Evangelist says that the unclean spirits fell down before him, he intends that the persons possessed fell down thus before him. In such facts of possession, the powers of the man became completely dominated by the demon, so that the evil spirit moved the members of the human body at will. It was as if the demon had taken to himself a body. Hence the action is ascribed to the real actor, the evil spirit. It was not worship that moved the demons to fall down before Christ. It was the majesty of God, clearly recognized in Jesus. That same power causes the demons to tremble in Hell. The demons were simply forced by the awful presence of God in Jesus to fall prostrate.

The presence of evil in the universe of God is a fearful mystery. The existence of Satan among the creatures of God is hard to understand. How dark and dismal must be the city of woe over which Satan rules, and where God is feared and hated! And multitudes are walking the earth, with never a thought for their destiny, who are not removed one hour of time from that hopeless land of woe.

The full and detailed account of the event is received from Mark, but Matthew has authentically testified that in this event was fulfilled the Messianic prophecy of Isaiah XLII. 1-4. The Septuagint version of the first verse of this passage is thus rendered by Walton: "Jacob puer meus, assumam eum: Israel electus meus, suscepit eum anima mea." Here the Septuagint is defective. The Messianic character of the passage is obscured by its application to the race of Jacob. In many things the chosen people were types of the Messiah, but not here. In the Hebrew text there is no mention of the chosen people, and all things persuade us to see in it a direct Messianic testimony without the intervention of type. In fact, the Rabbi Abarbanel declares that they who do not interpret the passage of Christ are smitten with blindness. As it is an important Messianic testimony, it will not be amiss to examine it more closely. In the Hebrew it stands thus: "Behold my servant, whom I uphold; my chosen in whom my soul delighteth: I have put my Spirit upon him; he shall bring forth judgment to the nations. He shall not cry, nor lift up nor cause his voice to be heard in the street. The bruised reed he shall not break, and the dimly burning wick he shall not quench: he shall bring forth judgment in truth. He shall not fail nor grow weak, till he have set judgment in the earth; and the isles shall wait for his law." The Targum of Jonathan, and the Peshitto Syriac are substantially in accord with this version of the Hebrew.

St. Matthew has not literally rendered the Hebrew, but has given us the sense. The application of the prophecy to this special event in Christ's life is evident from the sense of the prophecy. It outlines in a general way the characteristics of Christ's life. From the prophecy, we find these to be power, peace, meekness, and mercy, and the teaching of the Gentiles. His power was shown in his wonderful works; his peace and meekness in the fact that he withdrew from the cities out into the peaceful plains by the sea, offering no opposition to his enemies, nor justification of himself. His mercy and tenderness appear from the fact that he healed every infirmity, and banished the demons. St. Matthew reproduces the sense, but, as the original is fuller and clearer, we shall comment it as it

stands in the original Hebrew, and, at the same time, harmonize the sense of Matthew with the sense of Isaiah. The introductory particle calls attention to the magnitude of the revelation contained in the following words. The Messiah is called the servant of his Father, not to imply essential inferiority, but because the Word took upon himself the form of a slave, to do his Father's will. In the prophecy, the human nature is especially brought out, and the things predicated are what the Word wrought in his Incarnation. The term עֶבֶד, *my servant*, calls especial attention to the fact that all the resources of the human nature of Christ were spent in accomplishing the will of the Father. He was the servant of God, not merely because he was appointed to do a certain commission of God, but because he put his human life into the actual service of God. In the next clause: "—whom I uphold," there is declared the influence of the Divinity on the human nature and work of Christ. The hypostatic union is not clearly revealed here; but men are prepared for it, by being taught that the power back of Christ was the power of God. This mighty power working through the humanity of Christ wrought those great works which redeemed the world, proved his Divinity, and established the kingdom of God on earth.

The next clause: "— my chosen in whom my soul delighteth," is very beautiful. Jesus was the elect and beloved of God in every sense. Election, as man uses the term, carries with it the sense of comparison with other things, and preference over them. This, of course, only applies to Christ's human nature. The prophecy speaks of the Christ as he appeared to man. They saw a man, and the Prophet tells them how great was this man. The human nature of Christ was elected by God, and was exalted over all other creatures. Although we never divide Jesus Christ, still we must recognize that his human nature was a perfect man, the most perfect of men, and as such it was subject to the election of God. The human nature of Christ by a perfect use of its human reason, and free will executed the will of God, and thus became the object of the love of God. In this way, the act of divine love which had from all eternity rested on the Word, was extended

to the elect humanity of Christ, which had no existence before it became the flesh of the Word. The Word, therefore, as a man among men was the elect above all men, and, in this form, he worked out every design of the divine plan. This love of the Father for the humanity of Jesus brings the Father nearer to us through Jesus. The distance between God and man is infinite, but it has been bridged over, in a certain sense, by the great mystery of the Incarnation.

The next clause is: “—I have put my Spirit upon him.” The Greek of Matthew here speaks of the giving of the Spirit as a future event. The variant is readily explained. The prophet is speaking of the whole event as it appeared to him in the ideal order of prophecy. In this order, he speaks of the Messiah as already *in actu*. In prophetic vision, often things separated by long ages are represented as actually existing. But Matthew views the event as it was fulfilled in the actual order of real being, and thus brings out the concept of futurity which the event demanded, when taken out of the ideal order. The declaration of God imported that the man Jesus moved in the power and in the Spirit of God. The affirmation that the Spirit of God was upon one, could be made of any special communication of the Divinity. It affirmed that God was with the man; and, of itself, it would leave indeterminate the exact mode of the communication. It was an invitation to men to listen to a man’s message, because it was sent by the authority of God. Now these things were common to Christ and the prophets. But the mode of communication of the Divinity to Christ was ineffably greater than was given to them. The truths of the New Law were too vast to be enunciated in one proposition. We have need to look at Christ from many points, and divide up the great revelation, to come at a clear knowledge of what he was in himself, and what he is to us. Human comprehension is a very little thing compared to the infinite truths of God. Hence, although from this sole passage, Christ is not differentiated from the prophets and holy men of God, it is a means of arriving at his true natures. For this declaration makes him a Prophet, and authorizes him to speak in God’s name; and if we listen to him as such, he will tell us all we need to know. The phrase actually did express in truth

and in the mind of Christ that he was God. We only arrive at its full import after the knowledge of other divine teaching.

Isaiah esteems much this mode of speaking of the Lord. In Chap. XI. 2, he declares that the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon the Christ; and in Chap. LXI. he places in the mouth of the Lord that famous prophecy which the Lord expounded at Nazareth: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me."

"He shall bring forth judgment to the nations." The key to the understanding of this clause consists in the possession of the real sense of the word מִשְׁפֵּט, *judgment*. In the present predication, the term is of great comprehension. The mighty mind of God moving the inspired agent placed in the term a great truth, which our little minds have difficulty to seize in its fulness. The term מִשְׁפֵּט in its first signification means either the act of judging in any issue, or the sentence of the judge. This certainly is not the main signification here. The second signification is "*jus, quod justum, legitimum, legibus consentaneum est.*" This is the chief sense of the term as used here. It was the announcement that Christ would promulgate the great law of the Gospel to all the races of men. That great law embraced all that man was called to believe, and to do; it covered everything in man's universe, ordering all to be conformable to the divine idea. Moreover, it formed the criterion and law of judgment in God's sentence of human life. It was, in a word, the whole system of supernatural truth, both as it related to man's present life, forming his law of belief and duty, and as it related to his future destiny, being the basis of the sentence of God. Christ promulgated this law to the Gentiles, first by instituting an economy which embraced them; secondly, by placing in the world a system of truths announcing salvation to Jew and to Gentile; and, thirdly, by founding a teaching body which should teach all men.

"He shall not cry out, nor lift up (his voice), nor cause his voice to be heard in the street." The verb נָצַח here signifies noise, confusion, wrangling, and contentious disputing. This is also the sense of ἐρίζω as here employed by St. Matthew. God's action in the universe is characterized by peace and tranquil order. He achieves his mighty purposes without

noise, violence, or confusion. The idea of haste, excitement, or contention is so contrary to the conception of a divinity that the pagans represented their deities as placid amid the convulsions of nature. Thus Virgil represents Neptune as thrusting forth his "placidum caput" in the dreadful storm excited by Juno's wrath.—Æneid I. 126. God is patient, because he is eternal; he is serene, because he is almighty. Noise and contention in an intellectual agent always show forth defect, and limitation of power. God, who has the absolute power over all things, can not be troubled concerning the event of things. This peace of God is well brought out in the vision of Eliah, I. Kings, XIX. 11—12: "And he [God] said [to Eliah]: Go forth and stand upon the mount before the Lord. And behold the Lord passeth by, and a great and strong wind rent the mountains, and broke in pieces the rocks before the Lord. But the Lord was not in the wind: and after the wind an earthquake; but the Lord was not in the earthquake: and after the earthquake a fire; but the Lord was not in the fire. And after the fire a soft, gentle voice. And when Eliah heard it, he wrapped his face in his mantle, and coming forth, stood in the entrance to the cave. And, behold, there came a voice unto him saying: What dost thou here, Eliah?"

The tenor of Christ's life and actions was like that of his Heavenly Father. He possessed the fulness of the power of the Divinity, and he was sure of the success of his work. His works were the effect of inevitable power working through meekness and that beautiful calm which we always find in the divine life. It was the peace and meekness of power, not of weakness. Where God is, there is always peace; where he is not, there are chaotic disorder and the clamor of Sodom. Now Christ's way is always the best way. The more God-like a man becomes, the more will that holy peace and calm invest his life; the more will he shrink away from the clamor of the discordant world. Conformity to Christ in this will develop in man the gospel of non-resistance.

It is to be observed that in the Hebrew the term נֶפֶשׁ from נָפַח has no explicit object. Some supply the term "personam,"

and they believe the sense to be that the Lord will show no distinction of persons in his dealings with humanity. This opinion disagrees with the context. The proper object to supply is "his voice," by which the sense becomes as one with what precedes, and with what follows. It was the prophetic warrant that Christ should not be a noisy agitator. He would bring men to his way of thinking, not by noisy street canvassing, but by the silent, calm power of his truths, and the evidence of his works. Christ's life was active and intense, but it was a dignified, serene activity like the activity of his Father.

"The bruised reed he shall not break, and the dimly burning wick he shall not quench." The reed is by nature tender and easily broken. It is for this reason often taken as an example of a being that easily fails before opposition. Now when it has been shaken and bruised by the wind, it is a fit type of a man crushed and discouraged by sin and misery. A reed in such a condition is of no appreciable worth in the possessions of man. No man cares aught for it. And so it is with man. Christ seeks to save those whom sin and misfortune have brought to that point where no man cares aught for them. Down into the depths of human misery and crime, where men are hardened by cold selfishness and a world's scorn, comes the message from Heaven, and finds an echo in the human conscience, and arouses man to hope and to rise. The phrase is a beautiful metaphor, in which the bruised reed represents the sinner. Some have applied the metaphor to the Jewish people, and have thereby restricted its legitimate sense. It applies to every man. By its truth we declare that no man can say: "I have travelled so far away from the Lord, that I can not go back." No man can say: "The world cares naught for me, my life is valueless; and God is against me." Lift up thy heart, O bruised reed. God is against thy sin, but not against thee; he has mercy, forgiveness, Heaven for thee, in return for earnest repentance, and a purpose of amendment. When the winds of an unjust and hard world have bruised the reed, and it lies scorned and unthought of in its misery, there is one hope that the Lord Jesus is at hand, not to crush the poor prostrate reed, but to raise it up, and protect it, and give it strength to stand and to live.

The next metaphor is of similar import. It is taken from an object in the ordinary life of the Hebrew people. Their lamps were of olive oil, with wicks of flax. The feeble flame of the wick of a lamp which needs replenishing is a good example of the faint flickering of the light of faith and love in the human heart. And Christ repels not even this. The tenderness and mercy of Christ will go down to any depth of human misery, will have compassion on all man's weakness, if man will admit him. The simile of the dying flame is apt. It gives no light, has no vigor, is useless, and unsightly, and is close to extinction. So it is with the weak, unprofitable Christian. His life shines not before men unto the glory of God. His soul has no vigor, no positiveness in it. There is no profit in his life for the eternal things of God. All is dark in his life, except a mere faint flickering of the light of Christ; and although Christ stands ready to replenish the lamp, too often the winds of passion blow it out entirely, and then the soul is in the darkness of spiritual death. Let a man ask himself: Is the lamp burning brightly in my soul, or is the flame dying? And if it be faint and close to death, let him arouse himself from lethargy, and throw himself on Christ, who does not extinguish the feebly burning flax.

"He shall bring forth judgment in truth." The grandest thing that one can say of a man is that he is true; the grandest thing that can be said of a man's work is that it is true,—true in the full comprehension of the term; true in the sense that the Holy Ghost here predicated it of the achievement of Christ. Truth is the correspondence of part to part in the universe, and of the whole universe to God. Falsehood steals away the world from God; truth holds it eternally fixed to him. If the world moved in truth, it would move towards God. Every infraction of the great law of God is an infraction of truth. Christ gave the law of God to the world according to truth. The truth of his message superseded the weak types and provisional statutes of the Old Law, and dispelled the errors of paganism in the Gentile world. It placed God in his right relations to the world, and taught the world to render to him what was his due.

"He shall not fail, nor grow weak, till he have set judgment in the earth." This member predicts the absolute success of

Christ's work. He should be contradicted, and he should give place to his opponents. He should be meek and lowly; he should shrink away from noisy demonstration and strife; but he should not fail. There was working through him that awful inevitable power of God, which can not fail. Preserving the grand order of the beings of God, Christ only relied on his human nature for the things that were of its province. In the execution of the higher things, he relied on the divine power. However great be the temporary contradictions and defeats, in the end, the cause of God always triumphs. It does this by ways and means unlike those of men. So the cause of Christ triumphed even through his seeming defeat and overthrow by his enemies, when he died on the cross. So shall every man succeed who relies on the power of God to do God's work. It is not by reliance on our human methods and force that we succeed in great enterprises for God. God wishes that a man be active and tenacious of purpose; but unless all be based on the divine power, the grandest efforts will be abortive, and that which seems success will not in reality be such. Moreover when we have trusted in the divine power to do some work for God, and have met with seeming defeat, we may be sure that in the grand working out of the divine plan, the work is a success.

The passage in Matthew is in form of expression much different from that of the original of the Prophet. The sense, however, is the same. They both place before the mind the leading thought that Christ should succeed in giving to the world the great law of God. Matthew speaks of it as a victory in combat; the Prophet describes it as the non-failing in the object of his life. It is curious to note that the same verb כָּהַן is affirmed of the flax and denied of Christ. Of course, the flame of the flax in reality meant the presence of the divine in man. When spoken of man, the flame was dim and dying because the divine influence was feeble; the concept of the same verb is denied of Christ, because in him dwelt the fulness of the Godhead. The grand achievement of Christ's life, his victory and his legacy to man is Redemption and his law. The status of man in the scale of being as viewed by God is the part which man has in that "judgment" which Christ placed on earth.

Judgment here means the truth of the Gospel of Christ, which established justice and right in all the affairs of men.

"And the isles shall wait for his law." The first discrepancy that here exists between Matthew and Isaiah is that Matthew has *explained* the metaphor of the prophet. The Hebrews were wont to speak of the great world lying outside of the land which they had explored as the "Isles of the Gentiles." It is evident therefore that the Prophet here employs a metonymy, using the place for the inhabitant. Matthew dispenses with the figure, and makes the sense bolder. The words of the Prophet do not declare that the pagan nations were expecting Christ with a well-formed idea of the event, and an intelligent hope that he should come. Poor humanity was immersed in ignorance, and while they had naught to content the eternal yearnings of the human heart, they knew no hope. Some of the grander spirits of those ages penetrated, in some degree, the darkness, and expressed a belief in some greater revelation of God to man than had yet been given, but they had not a clear conception of how this should be. The coming of Christ, as a definite event, was looked forward to only by Israel. The Prophet's words were not intended to change the attitude of pagan thought before Christ's coming, but rather to form a source of proof to all men of every age to whom the message should come, that the Law of Christ was for all men.

Another divergency exists between Matthew and Isaiah; for where the prophet declares that the Gentiles "shall wait for his law;" Matthew says that they "shall hope in his name." The only real difference is in the use of Christ's *name* by Matthew for Christ's *law* of the prophet. The term יְהוָה signifies the looking forward to a thing with hope, and Matthew brings out the chief concept of the term. The prophet's words simply predict that the event will come when the Gentile nations will turn to Christ, and place their faith and their hope in his law. Matthew exercises his right as an inspired agent to use freely a preceding revelation, but still both expressions are reducible to the same central sense. To look forward to and hope in Christ's name is to look forward to and hope in Christ himself. To hope in Christ is to hope in all that he stands for,

all that he is to us. Now what Christ is to us is embodied in his law. Christ and his law are identical in their relations to human life, for the knowledge and observance of his law simply bring Christ into our lives. It is immaterial, therefore, whether we speak of Christ or his law in their relation to human life, for his law is the means of binding up our lives with Christ.

MATT. IX. 35-38.

MARK III. 13-19.

35. Καὶ περιῆγεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὰς πόλεις πάσας καὶ τὰς κώμας διδάσκων ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν καὶ κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας καὶ θεραπεύων πᾶσαν νόσον καὶ πᾶσαν μαλακίαν.

36. Ἰδὼν δὲ τοὺς ὄχλους ἐσπλαγχνίσθη περὶ αὐτῶν ὅτι ἦσαν ἐσकुμένοι καὶ ἐριμμένοι ὡσεὶ πρόβατα μὴ ἔχοντα ποιμένα.

37. Τότε λέγει τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ: Ὁ μὲν θερισμὸς πολὺς, οἱ δὲ ἐργάται ὀλίγοι.

38. Δεήθητε οὖν τοῦ Κυρίου τοῦ θερισμοῦ, ὥπως ἐκβάλῃ ἐργάτας εἰς τὸν θερισμὸν αὐτοῦ.

X. 1. Καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος τοὺς δώδεκα μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν πνευμάτων ἀκαθάρτων ὥστε ἐκβάλλει αὐτὰ καὶ θεραπεύειν πᾶσαν νόσον καὶ πᾶσαν μαλακίαν.

2. Τῶν δὲ δώδεκα ἀποστόλων τὰ ὀνόματά ἐστιν ταῦτα: πρῶτος Σίμων ὁ λεγόμενος Πέτρος καὶ Ἀνδρέας ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ.

3. Καὶ Ἰάκωβος ὁ τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου καὶ Ἰωάννης ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ, Φίλιππος καὶ Βαρθολομαῖος, Θωμᾶς καὶ Ματθαῖος ὁ τελώνης, Ἰάκωβος ὁ τοῦ Ἀλφαίου καὶ Θαδδαῖος.

13. Καὶ ἀναβαίνει εἰς τὸ ὄρος, καὶ προσκαλεῖται οὓς ἤθελεν αὐτός: καὶ ἀπῆλθον πρὸς αὐτόν.

14. Καὶ ἐποίησεν δώδεκα, οὓς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασεν, ἵνα ὥσι μετ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἵνα ἀποστέλλῃ αὐτοὺς κηρύσσειν,

15. Καὶ ἔχειν ἐξουσίαν ἐκβάλλειν τὰ δαιμόνια.

16. Καὶ ἐποίησεν τοὺς δώδεκα καὶ ἐπέθηκεν ὄνομα τῷ Σίμωνι, Πέτρον.

17. Καὶ Ἰάκωβον τὸν Ζεβεδαίου καὶ Ἰωάννην τὸν ἀδελφὸν τοῦ Ἰακώβου: καὶ ἐπέθηκεν αὐτοῖς ὄνομα Βοανεργές, ὃ ἐστίν, Υἱοὶ βροντῆς.

18. Καὶ Ἀνδρέαν, καὶ Φίλιππον,
καὶ Βαρθολομαῖον, καὶ Μαθθαῖον,
καὶ Θωμᾶν καὶ Ἰάκωβον τὸν τοῦ
Ἀλφαίου, καὶ Θαδδαῖον, καὶ Σίμωνα
τὸν Καναναῖον.

4. Σίμων ὁ Καναναῖος καὶ Ἰού-
δας ὁ Ἰσκαριώτης ὁ καὶ παραδοὺς
αὐτόν.

19. Καὶ Ἰούδαν Ἰσκαριώθ, ὃς
καὶ παρέδωκεν αὐτόν.

35. And Jesus went about
all the cities and the villages,
teaching in their synagogues,
and preaching the Gospel of
the kingdom, and healing all
manner of disease and all
manner of sickness.

13. And he goeth up into
the mountain, and calleth unto
him whom he himself would:
and they went unto him.

36. But when he saw the
multitudes, he was moved with
compassion for them, because
they were distressed and scat-
tered, as sheep not having a
shepherd.

37. Then saith he unto his
disciples: The harvest truly
is plenteous, but the laborers
are few.

38. Pray ye therefore the
Lord of the harvest, that he
send forth laborers into his
harvest.

X. 1. And he called unto
him his twelve disciples, and
gave them authority over un-
clean spirits, to cast them out,
and to heal all manner of
disease and all manner of
sickness.

14. And he appointed
twelve, that they might be with
him, and that he might send
them forth to preach,

15. And to have authority
to cast out devils:

2. Now the names of the twelve Apostles are these: The first, Simon, who is called Peter, and Andrew his brother; James the son of Zebedee, and John his brother;

3. Philip, and Bartholomew; Thomas, and Matthew the publican; James the son of Alphæus, and Thaddæus;

4. Simon the Cananæan, and Judas Iscariot, who also betrayed him.

16. And Simon he sur-named Peter;

17. And James the son of Zebedee, and John the brother of James; and them he sur-named Boanerges, which is, Sons of thunder:

18. And Andrew, and Philip, and Bartholomew, and Matthew, and Thomas, and James the son of Alphæus, and Thaddæus, and Simon the Cananæan,

19. And Judas Iscariot, who also betrayed him.

LUKE VI. 12-16.

12. And it came to pass in these days, that he went out into the mountain to pray; and he continued all night in prayer to God.

13. And when it was day, he called his disciples: and he chose from them twelve, whom also he named Apostles;

14. Simon, whom he also named Peter, and Andrew his brother, and James and John, and Philip and Bartholomew,

15. And Matthew and Thomas, and James the son of Alphæus, and Simon who was called the Zealot,

16. And Judas the brother of James, and Judas Iscariot who was the traitor.

12. Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις ἐξελθεῖν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ ὄρος προσεύξασθαι: καὶ ἦν διανυκτερεύων ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ.

13. Καὶ ὅτε ἐγένετο ἡμέρα, προσεφώνησεν τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ: καὶ ἐκλεξάμενος ἀπ' αὐτῶν δώδεκα, οὓς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασεν:

14. Σίμωνα δὲν καὶ ὠνόμασεν Πέτρον, καὶ Ἀνδρέαν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ, καὶ Ἰακώβον καὶ Ἰωάννην καὶ Φίλιππον καὶ Βαρθολομαῖον,

15. Καὶ Ματθαῖον καὶ Θωμᾶν, Ἰακώβον Ἀλφαίου καὶ Σίμωνα τὸν καλούμενον Ζηλωτὴν,

16. Καὶ Ἰούδαν Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰούδαν Ἰσκαριώθ, ὃς ἐγένετο προδοτής.

In the thirty-sixth verse, though some good authorities have ἔρρημένοι, the greater number have ἔρριμμένοι, which appears in **ℵ**, B and C as ἔριμμένοι. In the third verse of the tenth chapter of Matthew, Tischendorf places Λεββαῖος in place of Θαδδαῖος, on the authority of D. We find the reading: Λεββαῖος ὁ ἐπικληθεὶς Θαδδαῖος in C², E, F, G, K, L, M, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Π; and this reading is followed by the Syriac, Armenian, and Ethiopian versions. In the fourth verse **ℵ**, E, F, G, et al. have the reading Κανανίτης, but B, C, D, and L, have Καναναῖος.

In the fourteenth verse of Mark, the clause: οὓς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασεν is found in **ℵ**, B and Δ; it is retained by the Coptic and Ethiopian versions. In the fifteenth verse of Mark, we find the clause: θεραπεύειν τὰς νόσους in A, C, D, P, Γ, Π et al. This reading is followed by the Vulgate, Syriac, Armenian, and Gothic versions. It is not found in **ℵ**, B, C*, L, and Δ. Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort reject it. In the sixteenth verse, the clause: καὶ ἐποίησεν τοὺς δώδεκα, which is omitted in the Vulgate, is found in **ℵ**, B, C*, and Δ. It also has the approval of Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort.

The Lord was the Good Shepherd, and he has given in his life a grand and perfect example of what a shepherd of men should be. First, his life was ever active in his work; his thought and his powers of body were put into the great business of building up the kingdom of God. His method also was perfect. He waited not that the people should come to him seeking salvation; he went in search of them; not alone in the cities, but out in the small villages, out into the fields, and wherever man is found. Then also he was merciful and kind to all. He had compassion on every ill; his works added force to his words. The mercy shown to the body was but a means of reaching the soul. A man will open up his soul to a man who convinces him that he is willing and able to help him. As we come to the knowledge of these facts in the life of Jesus, we may hear his voice coming to us in the power of the Holy Ghost: "Go ye and do likewise." If man's life ever becomes so busy or so noisy that he can not hear that voice, then is his estate wretched indeed. One cannot follow Jesus unless he hear his voice, and the clamor of the world can shut out that voice.

In this mission of teaching and mercy, Jesus took with him his disciples to mould them by his influence, that they might be able to carry on the work after him. The divine plan contemplates the generality of mankind as sheep to be cared for by shepherds. This was the plan of God from the beginning, and it ever shall be.

As the Lord journeyed through that Eastern land, and saw the wretched condition of his people through the wickedness of those first shepherds, he was filled with compassion for the people. The Evangelist declares that the sheep were *ἐσκυλμένοι*. This participle is derived from *σκύλλω*, *to rend, to mangle, to tear*. In its metaphorical sense it means to harass, to trouble. The simile is founded on a fact of Eastern life. It required the perpetual vigilance of the shepherd to ward off the attacks of the wolves, and save the flocks from their depredations. The change in our customs and modes of life has weakened the force of the figure; and to realize its full force and application, we must go back in spirit to the modes of life of that people. The evil that befel the flock which was neglected was that the wolf came and harassed and rent the sheep of the fold. So it was in the metaphorical sense with the people of God. Those who should have fed them the spiritual food of truth and righteousness were false to their trust. They fed them on error, and filched from them their possessions. They abandoned them to the wolves of error and ignorance; and thus were they mangled and torn. The baseness of the teachers of Israel is thus set forth by Micah III. 1-3, 5; 11-12: "And I said: Hear, O ye princes of Jacob, and ye chiefs of the house of Israel; is it not your part to know judgment, you that hate the good and love the evil; that with violence pluck off their skins from them, and their flesh from their bones? who have eaten the flesh of my people, and have flayed their skin from off them; and have broken and chopped their bones as for the kettle and as flesh in the midst of the pot." "Thus saith the Lord concerning the prophets that make my people err: that bite with their teeth and preach peace: and if a man give not something into their mouth, they prepare war against him." "Her princes have judged for bribes, and her priests have taught for hire, and her prophets divined for money; yet will

they lean upon the Lord and say: Is not the Lord among us? no evil can come upon us. Therefore because of you Zion shall be ploughed as a field, and Jerusalem shall be as a heap of stones, and the mountain of the temple as the high places of the forests."

The words of Ezekiel are equally forcible: "Woe unto the shepherds of Israel who feed themselves! Should not the shepherds feed the sheep? Ye eat the fat and ye clothe you with the wool, ye kill the fatlings; but ye feed not the sheep. The diseased ye have not strengthened, neither have ye healed that which was sick, neither have ye bound up that which was broken, neither have ye brought again that which was driven away, neither have ye sought that which was lost; but with force and with rigor have ye ruled over them; and they were scattered, because there was no shepherd. . . . Therefore, ye shepherds hear the word of the Lord. . . . Behold, I am against the shepherds, and I will require my sheep at their hand."—Ezek. XXXIV. 2-10.

The Evangelist also declares that the sheep were *ἐρριμμένοι*. This participle from *ρίπτω* properly means to cast out, to throw away, waste, to throw about. The figure is forcible. Under the faithless, negligent shepherd, the sheep strayed away from the fold and became hunted and knocked about, a stray, homeless wanderer, with no one to claim it, or care for it. What a powerful mode of representing the man who has lost the key to the mystery of life? There is no such wretched being in the universe as man living without a knowledge of his Creator and his end. That wretchedness is not relieved by gold, fame, or power. Human life is ordained by God to move towards one goal, and if it moves away from that goal, it is a wretched failure. The consideration comes before us here, what a dreadful thing it is for a shepherd of God to prove faithless to his sacred trust? The dearest thing that God has in all this world is the souls of men. For these possessions he paid the price of the blood of his Son; and he has decreed to entrust this possession to men to guard it and bring it to him. All is great about it. The trust is great, the responsibility is great, the labor is great, the reward is great, or the punishment is great. If we wish to know how terrible is the punishment of

the faithless shepherd, let us give ear to the prophet Ezechiel III. 17: "Son of man, I have made thee a watchman over the house of Israel: and thou shalt hear the word out of my mouth, and shalt tell it to them from me. If when I say to the wicked: Thou shalt surely die, thou declare it not to him, nor speak to him that he may be converted from his wicked way and live; the same wicked man shall die in his iniquity; but I will require his blood at thy hand." And again in Verse 20: "Moreover, if the just man shall turn away from his justice, and shall commit iniquity, and I lay a stumbling-block before him, he shall die: because thou hast not given him warning; he shall die in his sin, and his righteousness which he hath done shall not be remembered, but I will require his blood at thy hand." What a terrible thing to be charged by the angry Judge with the blood of those for whom he died? And if this be true of the merely negligent shepherd, how much more does it avail of the shepherd who by direct scandal or positive co-operation leads souls down to hell? How will the shepherd respond in judgment, who has perhaps led innocence astray, and made use of the trust reposed in his character to wreck the lives entrusted to his care?

It is true that in the New Law the power of God is not bound to the second causes in such way that its action is absolutely dependent on them. The issue is shrouded in mystery, but we know that the omnipotence of God triumphs over the weakness of the second agent, and saves by the intrinsic power of Sacraments, even when the shepherd unworthily administers them. But this lessens not the responsibility; because God wishes to bind the world to himself through his shepherds; and although strong minds and pure hearts may endure through the neglect or the scandal, there are others who perish for lack of that help that God destined should come to them through his representatives. Why it is so, we can not tell, but it is so, and it is terrible, that there are souls that will be saved, if the shepherd be faithful, and lost, if he be false to his trust.

As the Lord witnessed by personal experience the sad condition of the world made desolate by the faithlessness of those first teachers, he is moved straightway to found a new

school of teachers. He does not change the method of dealing with the world. It has ever been and ever will be God's method of teaching the world to employ oral teaching. A reflection upon the nature of human life will justify the wisdom of this method. God has not created mankind as absolutely independent beings, with no need of each other for the maintenance of their lives. He is the author of order in the social body, and he moves man to organization in society and in religion. Men are members of an organized body. Now, therefore, it is essentially opposed to God's dealings with a body politic that he should establish absolutely independent relations with every individual in the affairs of religion. There is certainly personal communication between God and the individual, but it does not supersede the appointed teaching authority in the organized body. In conformity with man's composite nature, the organization furnishes man the means to come into personal communication with God. Nor would it be sufficient to place in the possession of that organized body a code of Scriptures. The message of Christ is for the poor and illiterate, as well as for the learned; it is for busy toilers, who have not time nor philosophical depth to draw the meaning from the written instrument. Wherefore Christ both taught man, and commanded that he should be taught, by the living voice. And experience confirms this position. Even to-day, in these days of enlightenment, how few of the worshippers of God have drawn their religion directly out of the Bible? The Bible is the code of God, grand and true; but it has need of those who shall devote their lives to expound it to the people. It is the living voice of the patient nun teaching catechism in the school, of the priest in church and school, of the bishops in the councils, of the Pope from the throne of Peter, that teaches the world with the aid of the Spirit even to the end of time. Around the throne of God are gathered legions of elect souls brought thither by oral teaching who never read one line of the Bible.

The selection of the Apostolic College was a decisive event in the Lord's work, and for it he prepares by prayer.

Looking out upon the whole world, and taking a grand comprehensive view of human life, Jesus turns to the men whom

he had associated with himself in his labors, and addresses them thus: "The harvest indeed is great, but the laborers are few. Pray ye, therefore, the Lord of the harvest that he send forth laborers into the harvest." The harvest field is mankind, with its great possibilities of faith and love of God, waiting to be developed and brought home to God. The plan of God contemplates not the gathering of this harvest by the sole direct influence of God in the human soul, as some of our day believe. If such were the case, why the need of laborers? God does work directly in the souls of men, but in so doing, he does not supersede the work of the teacher. He decreed to gather his world-harvest of souls by means of laborers, by means of men authorized to work for his cause. The laborers were few, because they who had been sent to plough and sow and reap those fields of God had been faithless; and the world presented the aspect of a great harvest field perishing for the want of a man to put forth his hand and gather it in. Such is the world in its relations to God. All that he receives out of it is the grain which the power of the sunshine of his grace fructifies, and the rain of his indwelling spirit irrigates, and the zealous industry of his laborers cares for, and gathers, and separates from the cockle, and offers to God the Father, here called the Lord of the harvest. The labor of the husbandman would avail naught without the sunshine and the rain; but neither do the sunshine and the rain operate independently of the laborer: the influence of God and the industry of man combine to save the human harvest of the world.

But all good works begin from God, and end in God. The Apostles must be taught where to look for strength in the great enterprise which was now to be given to them. God is to be petitioned for light to know the good and strength to do it, and therefore Christ invites the disciples to petition God to send the laborers into the field. It is the constant error of man to bring too much into prominence his own part in the deeds that he would do; to rely on the intensity of personal endeavor, to the obscuring of God's part. The arm of the Lord is not shortened; it does not fatigue him to show power. Human endeavor should be intense; in these days there is not enough of the intensity of the Baptist; but human endeavor should begin

with prayer; should be rooted in prayer; and should give to the power of God its proper place in the achievements of man.

Christ never says: "Go"; he says: "Come." So here, after bidding his disciples pray, he repaired into the mountain top, to go before them in prayer as an example. In every perfect work of man, God must have a part, and prayer is the means of bringing God into our work.

The Lake of Gennesaret is an extinct crater in the midst of mountains; and up into one of these, Christ repaired and spent the night in prayer. There is something about the top of a mountain conducive to higher aspirations. The altitude, the removal from the clamor of the world, the purer air, and the being alone with God, impress the soul with religious feelings. In prayer a man should, as far as possible, sever himself from earth, and come close to Heaven. The very elevation above the lower strata of atmosphere conduces to this. But did Christ, who enjoyed in his humanity the beatific vision, need thus to pray? He needed it not for himself, but we needed it. Christ lived for us, acted for us, prayed for us, died for us. Christ is our model in every perfect work; he is our model in prayer, and his prayer is like everything else in the life of Christ, transcendent. It was on that occasion one long ecstatic union of the human mind of Christ with his Heavenly Father. In that prayer he recommended to his Father his work, the foundation of his Church, the selection of his Apostles, and man whom he was to redeem. How grand and beautiful is the mystery, when the court of Heaven looked down on him in whom all things were created, in human form, there on the lonely mountain top absorbed in prayer for mankind! The lesson for man is that the work of God is promoted by prayer and activity combined. Enterprises of great moment are brought to successful issues by very weak agents by the power of prayer. "More things are wrought by prayer than this world dreams of." A man errs who believes that he satisfies by activity for the lack of prayer in his life. When a man is too busy to pray, his life is disordered. In prayer, we recognize what God's place is in human endeavor; we receive divine power in exchange for human thoughts.

And when morning was come, he called together his band of disciples, and called unto him whom he would. St. Mark is careful to mention Christ's free choice of the Apostles. By this is affirmed that the Apostles entered into the holy calling not by ambition, nor any human art, but because they were called as Aaron was called. With full knowledge of all things, the Lord knew that what he did there must be renewed many times in the history of his Church. He established the law by which it should be done. It was directed by prayer, and the choice was uninfluenced by human motive. Had such affairs ever since been conducted in that holy manner, many dark pages in the Church's history would not have been written.

And he chose twelve. As the first chosen people was propagated from twelve tribal chiefs, so the people of the New Alliance were spiritually begotten by twelve Fathers. The analogy rests on the authority of Paul, I. Cor. IV. 15: "For if you have ten thousand instructors in Christ, yet ye have not many fathers; for in Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the Gospel." Gal. IV. 19: "My little children, of whom I am in labor again until Christ be formed in you." Philemon I. 10: "I beseech thee for my son Onesimus, whom I have begotten in my chains." By the power of God those twelve formed the new people of God. From them the hosts of Christ's true worshippers were propagated in every land, not by carnal descent but by the birth of the new creation in man. This spiritual kinship bound them to the Apostles; and that birth which can not trace its origin back to the Apostles is spurious. The action of Christ in choosing these twelve men, and his counsels and commands to them show plainly that he considered them the foundation of an organization which should be essentially bound to them by direct succession; so much so, that they themselves could be said to endure even to the final consummation of the world. Now, therefore, apostolic succession is an absolute essential and diacritic note of the Church of Christ. And it is only the Roman Catholic Church that can trace her pedigree back to Peter and to his associates; the births of other creeds are laid in fornication and dishonor.

The Lord gave to these men the name of Apostles, thereby designating what manner of life they should lead. They were

ἀπόστολοι from *ἀποστέλλω*, to send off, despatch on some service. They were to be messengers, ambassadors from the court of Heaven, and from the King of kings to the children of men. The mustard seed grew till it became a tree; and so that original band was destined to grow to vast proportions. The twelve have passed away, and millions have taken their place; but the law of their life is the same; they are messengers of God, ambassadors of Christ, to speak in his name even unto the end of time.

The power of miracles was needed in that period of the Church's life to arrest the attention of men, and cause them to listen to the message of the Apostles. The Church had not yet become conspicuous in the world, so that every man could find her. Therefore did Jesus equip these same ambassadors with the power to heal infirmity and to cast out demons. That power was given, not to change the conditions of man's earthly life, but to lead to supernatural faith. It remains in the Church to-day, and ever will remain, to be used when its exercise will strengthen the grasp of mortals on the kingdom of God.

The first name which appears in the Catalogue of the Apostles is Simon Peter. Concerning the name of Peter, we have seen its signification, and the circumstances of the giving of the name in John I. 42. Later on we shall see why the Lord gave this name to Simon. Mark and Luke speak of the event as though the name of Peter were given to the prince of the Apostles at this particular time. To bring this into accord with the aforementioned passage of John, some suppose that Jesus repeated what he had said on that preceding occasion. This is very probable. The giving of the name was a foreshadowing of a mighty commission to be given to Simon, and it seems certain that in the actual organization of the apostolic college, the Lord should renew the prophetic declaration of Simon's province in the Church, by the giving of this significant name. Again, others hold that in virtue of the first bestowal of the name of Peter recorded by St. John, the Lord commonly addressed Simon as Peter, and that therefore he addressed him as Peter in the present instance. The words of Mark and Luke form no objection to this opinion. They had not yet informed us of the cognomen Peter; and hence

without heed to chronology, they record the substantial fact at this juncture, where the personality of the Apostle is brought into especial prominence.

We also see that in all the catalogues, Peter is placed first. It is a part of the cumulative evidence of Peter's place in the Scriptures. Matthew even takes thought to add the numeral *πρῶτος*. Since the days of the Apostles, Catholics have held that his place in the catalogue signifies his place in the Church; that it is in virtue of his primacy in the Church that he is always placed at the head of the Apostolic College, and for the same reason Matthew calls him *the first*. Of course, the proof stands not alone, but gains strength from the many other evidences of Peter's pre-eminence. In fact, no other cause can be reasonably assigned for the term *the first*, here given by Matthew to Peter. He was not the first called, since he was brought to Christ by Andrew and John. He is not the first by mere coincidence, because while the order of the other Apostles is varied, Peter always retains first place. Moreover, Matthew is not speaking of the order of the selection of the twelve, but merely recording their names; and yet he gives to Peter that significant epithet, "the first." Plain evidence forces us to make the term equal to "the head."

In the catalogues of Matthew and Luke, the Apostle Andrew occupies the second place, but in Mark and also in Acts, I. 13, he is placed after the sons of Zebedee. The difference is merely accidental, since Andrew is always placed among the four greater Apostles, those who stood closest to the Lord.

We have seen the circumstances of Andrew's calling, Matt. IV. 18; Mark I. 16; Luke V. 2. At that time, Andrew was really constituted an Apostle; but in the present text that first appointment was confirmed to him and to the others previously chosen, and the official list of the twelve was closed.

Outside of the brief Gospel data but little is known of St. Andrew. The acts of his martyrdom are apocryphal and legendary. Probable data record that he preached the Gospel in the Greek colonies Heraclea, Sinope, Trapezontos, and Nicephorus, along the western coast of the Black Sea, and thence passed into Scythia. He returned thence to Jerusalem

through Neocæsarea and Samosata. In a second journey, he penetrated to Constantinople, passed into Greece, and was crucified at Patras in Achaia.

The calling of John the Evangelist and his brother James, called the Greater, is recorded in Mark I. 19—20 and parallel passages. We have here only to affirm of them, as we have said of Andrew, that their election was re-confirmed in the complete official list. The etymology of the term *βοανεργής*, or *βοανηργής*, is very obscure. As the Evangelist has explained its significance, the sense of the passage is in nowise involved in the etymological obscurity. Many derive the epithet from the two words *בְּנֵי־רָגַשׁ*. The rendering of the *scheva mobile* by *oa* is not uncommon in Greek. The principal difficulty in this opinion is that *רָגַשׁ* does not mean thunder, but the tumult of a crowd. To obviate this difficulty some have thought to substitute *רָעַשׁ* for *רָגַשׁ*. The sense of *רָעַשׁ* is that of violent movement, hence it can be applied to an earthquake. The proper Hebrew word for the thunder is *רָעַם*. Hence Jerome

ventured the opinion that the correct reading should be *Benereem*. Most probably the term in Mark is an attempt to reproduce the Aramaic form of this term. But it is far more profitable to consider the qualities in these men, which drew from the Lord this epithet. It was certainly a term of commendation, based on the passionate ardor of these grand spirits. They were souls filled with fire. Sometimes this fiery ardor was ill advised, as when they desired to call down the fire of heaven upon the Samaritan village, which refused to harbor the Master.—Luke IX. 54. But when the Holy Ghost had moulded their hearts of fire to the ways of God, the natural ardor of their temperament became transformed to a mighty zeal to spread the kingdom of God. The zeal of James made him hateful to Herod Agrippa, and Herod caused James to be beheaded by the sword.—Acts XII. 2. The other Son of thunder is better known to us. Christian art has, in some degree obscured the real character of this man. He is usually represented as a beardless youth, with a calm, mild face, with something of a virginal timidity in the tender eyes. The two

things that art has aimed to reproduce is that John was a virgin, and especially loved by Jesus. To invest him with that loveliness, painters give to him something of the grace of woman. But how different is the St. John of the Gospel! Of all the Apostles, John has the most power and sublimity. Like the lightning he opens the heavens, and records the awful message of the genesis of the Word. There is a mighty power in everything which he has written. He was intolerant of heresy, and on the testimony of Polycarp, we know that he ran from the bath in which he found Cerinthus the heretic. Finally, in the grand visions of the Apocalypse; in the vision of him who was as the sun, and held the keys of hell and death; in the vision of the throne of God; in the vision of the sealed book opened by the Lamb; in the vision of the four horses, and death and hell following the pale horse; in the vision of the darkening of the sun, the stars falling from heaven, and the departure of the heavens as a scroll is rolled together; in the vision of the movement of the mountains and islands, and the voice of men crying to the mountains to hide them from the face of God and the wrath of the Lamb; in the vision of the multitude which no man could number, clothed with white robes, praising the Lamb; in the vision of the rain of hail and fire and blood; in the vision of the opening of the bottomless pit, and the coming forth of the terrible horses, in form like locusts, with tails like scorpions; in the vision of the woman clothed with the sun, and of the dragon, and the war in Heaven, and the seven vials of wrath; in the vision of the fall of Babylon and the triumph of the Lamb,—in these does the mighty soul of this son of thunder reveal itself. And all that grand ardor of his nature concentrated itself in one great act of love of God; and when age had weakened his body, and he was close to that Heaven which he had so beautifully described, his parting injunction to his disciples was: "My little children, love one another." This is the right use to make of the faculties of nature and gifts of whatever kind; develop them, and then reduce them all into one grand act of love of God.

The Apostles may be divided into three groups of four in a group. Peter, James, John, and Andrew compose the first group. They were admitted to closer relations with Jesus than

the others. They were the only ones present at the raising to life of Jairus' daughter; the only ones at the Transfiguration; the only ones at the agony of the Saviour.

The second group opens with Philip, who always occupies the fifth place. He also was called in John I. 43, but his commission is confirmed in the present event. But little is known of his life. In the old Martyrology of St. Jerome, we find the following datum for the first of May: "*Natalis S. Philippi Apostoli in civitate Hierapoli, Provinciæ Asiæ.*" In the same Martyrology, his feast is associated with that of James, the brother of the Lord. The Martyrologium of Ven. Bede confirms the same. Florus, the celebrated deacon of the Church of Lyon in the ninth century, adds to the data of Bede that Philip suffered Martyrdom in Phrygia, and was buried there with his daughters. Usuardus, the celebrated Benedictine monk of the ninth century, disciple of Alcuin, in his Martyrology has the following: "*Natale Apostolorum Philippi et Jacobi, ex quibus Philippus postquam Scythiam ad fidem Christi convertisset apud Hierapolim Asiæ civitatem glorioso fine quievit.*" The Roman Martyrology adds that he was placed on a cross, and stoned. Many authorities state that he combated the Ebionite heresy in Asia, and Maurolycus states that he was stoned by the Ebionites. The Greeks honor St. Philip on the 14th of November. In the celebrated Menology published by authority of Basil Porphyrogenitus, we find this testimony: "Philip, one of the twelve Apostles, born at Bethsaida in Galilee, became famous for his miracles after the ascension of Christ. Under the Emperor Trajan, he set out for Hierapolis with his seven daughters, Marianne his sister, and Bartholomew the Apostle. Here by zealous preaching of the word of Jesus Christ, he converted from the vanity of idolatry a vast multitude of Gentiles, who together with Nicanora, the wife of the Proconsul, one of the chief men, were giving divine worship to a serpent. Hereupon, by order of the Proconsul, Philip and Bartholomew were suspended by the feet from a high wall. At the prayer of Philip, the earth opened, and swallowed the pagans, the Proconsul, the serpent and its priests. But by the singular benefit of God, except the Proconsul the author of the slaughter of the saints, and the serpent, all again

emerged into the open air. Bartholomew was freed, but Philip died in that same torment."—See Euseb. III. 31. Rufinus confirms the statement of Eusebius. Thus he writes in Hist. Eccles. III. 31: "Philip was one of the Apostles who went to sleep at Hierapolis, as also his two daughters who remained virgins to extreme old age; another of his daughters, filled with the Holy Ghost, abode at Ephesus." Nicephorus Callistus and St. Jerome endorse the same testimony. Clement of Alexandria also enumerates Philip among the Apostles who were married and had children. Some confusion has arisen also from the confounding of Philip the deacon and his daughters, with Philip the Apostle and his daughters.

The acts of Philip are apocryphal, and merit little faith. Still we may be reasonably sure that Philip was married; that he preached the faith in Scythia, and there met his death by martyrdom. Baronius places his martyrdom in the year 54, under Claudius. St. Hippolyte places Philip's martyrdom under Domitian, who reigned from 81 to 96. The latter opinion has far more probability, and we should place Philip's death about the year 87.

The next name in the apostolic catalogue is Bartholomew. The name is a patronymic, composed of the Aramaic terms בַּר *Bar*, *son*, and תְּלִמַי *Tholmai*. Modern exegetes have, with reason, identified this man with Nathanael, whose calling is recorded by St. John, I. 45. The account of John evidently supposes some friendship existing between Nathanael and Philip; for Philip brought Nathanael to Jesus. Now the words of Jesus to Nathanael on that occasion certainly imply that Nathanael was called to the apostolate; and if he be not Bartholomew, there is no place for him. Moreover, as he is always associated by the Evangelists with St. Philip, this would be readily explained on the supposition that he is Nathanael. Finally, Bartholomew must have had another name, for it is impossible that a man should only be known by his patronymic. We believe, therefore, that the two names refer to the same individual, and we refer the reader to the passage of St. John for the scanty data which history furnishes us of the Apostle. In temper, he seems to have been a plain, blunt, honest man; no enthusiast, but a calm, meditative nature.

Matthew is associated with Thomas. It is a curious fact, that the Apostles are joined in pairs in these catalogues. It was perhaps owing to the fact that they had been associated in some way before coming to the Lord, and he wisely sent them to labor in pairs. In the other catalogues, Matthew always precedes St. Thomas, but in the catalogue written by St. Matthew himself, he places himself after St. Thomas, and gives himself the designation of the publican, which is never added by the others. This is due to the admirable humility of the man. All that we are able to state of his life has been said in commenting the passage of Luke, V. 27-38. The name Thomas is derived from the Hebrew תָּאוֹם or תָּאוֹם, *the twin*. Hence, according to John II. 16, he was called *δίδυμος*, *the twin*. The character of St. Thomas, as revealed to us in the new Testament, is that of a matter-of-fact man; not gifted with much imagination,—a man who experienced much difficulty in grasping the supernatural; and who was slow to believe in unseen realities. There was a wisdom in the choice of such a man; for it convinces us that there was evidence enough in the origin of Christianity to force conviction even in this doubting heart. The data of his subsequent life are meager, and uncertain. The general tenor of early tradition connects him with Edessa, and with Parthia.—Euseb. III. 1. Sophronius, in an Appendix to the “De Viris Illustribus” of St. Jerome, says that St. Thomas preached the Gospel to the Parthians, Medes, Persians, Carmanians, Hyrcanians, Bactrians, and Magians, and that he died at Calamina in India. This is the basis of the Apocryphal acts of Thomas, and also of the Roman Breviary. The name of India in early literature is a vague term for the East. Hence, this term does not specify the seat of Thomas’ labors. When Vasco de Gama and Pedro de Cabral reached India in 1500, they found a well organized Christian Church, which claimed St. Thomas as its founder. The Christians of that place are even now called the Christians of St. Thomas. The district occupied by these people was part of Malabar, on the western side of the southern extremity of India, between the ninth and twelfth parallels of north latitude.

The manner of Thomas' death is generally placed to have been by martyrdom, although Clement of Alexandria cites the gnostic Heracleon to the effect that Thomas died a natural death.—Strom. IV. 9.

The next name in the list of Apostles is James, the son of Alphæus. This man is called James the Less in Mark XV. 40, where his mother is mentioned as Mary. In his Epistle to Galatians, I. 19, Paul speaks of one James, the brother of the Lord. There is also one of the Catholic Epistles written by James. Now there is an opinion which makes James, the brother of the Lord and author of this Epistle, distinct from James the Less. Some scattering data are found in early tradition for this position. The celebrated Bollandist P. Henschen adopted this theory; and it has been defended by Richard Simon, Zaccaria, Vincenzi, Danko, and Schegg. But we are convinced by solid arguments that one and the same person is designated as James, the brother of the Lord, and writer of the Epistle, and James the Less, son of Alphæus and Mary.

Our first and greatest argument is drawn from the words of St. Paul, Gal. I. 19. It was in his mind to prove to them that he had not received his Gospel and commission to preach from men, even from the Apostles; and for this reason he affirms that while at Jerusalem he saw no other Apostle, except James the brother of the Lord: "But other of the Apostles saw I none, save James the Lord's brother." Evidently, therefore, Paul makes James the brother of the Lord an Apostle. Now if he be not James the Less, there is no place for him in the catalogue. Certain protestants, who are opposed to our opinion, endeavor to enfeeble this argument by contending that Paul uses the word Apostle here in a wide sense to include any preacher of the Lord. But the general line of Paul's argument in the Epistle disproves this.

Again, James the Less, Joseph or Joses, Simon, and Jude, have as mother Mary, who is called by St. John, XIX. 25, the sister of the mother of Jesus, and wife of Clopas. The word Clopas, is but a more aspirated pronunciation of the Hebrew חֲלִפָּי, which in a less aspirated mode of pronunciation becomes Alphæus. This is conceded now by many modern exegetes.

But even if this were denied, the identity of the two men is not disproven; for the same individual may have borne two names.

The kinship between James the Less and the Lord may be explained in various ways. Eusebius in *Hist. Eccles.* III. 13, adduces the testimony of Hegesippus that Clopas and St. Joseph were brothers, which would make the Lord and James the Less cousins german. St. John, XIX. 25, affirms that Mary the wife of Clopas was the sister of the Blessed Virgin, which would equally justify the appellation, "the brothers of the Lord." Either of the opinions is sufficient to explain the Scriptural phrase, "the brothers of the Lord," and the ignorant calumny that it meant uterine brothers must be abandoned.

James the Less became the first bishop of Jerusalem. In the council of Jerusalem, he sustained Peter in removing the ritual ordinances from the Gentiles. His life and death are thus described from the testimony of Hegesippus by Eusebius, II. 23: "But the Jews, after Paul had appealed to Cæsar, and had been sent by Festus to Rome, frustrated in their hope of entrapping him by the snares they had laid, turned themselves against James, the brother of the Lord, to whom the episcopal seat at Jerusalem was committed by the Apostles. The following were their nefarious measures also against him. Conducting him into a public place, they demanded that he should renounce the faith of Christ before all the people; but contrary to the sentiments of all, with a firm voice, and much beyond their expectation, he declared himself fully before the whole multitude, and confessed that Jesus Christ was the Son of God, Saviour and Lord. Unable to bear any longer the testimony of the man, who, on account of his elevated virtue and piety was deemed the most just of men, they seized the opportunity of licentiousness afforded by the prevailing anarchy, and slew him."

In the catalogues of Matthew and Mark, Thaddæus is the tenth Apostle. In St. Luke, he is called Judas, the brother of James, and he is placed in the eleventh place. For the reading *Θαδδαῖος* of Matthew, Tischendorf read *Λεββαῖος*, which is the reading of Codex Bezaë. The reading "Thaddæus who is called Lebbæus" has the authority of Codices C², E, F, G, K, L, M,

S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Π, both Syriac versions, and of the Armenian and the Ethiopian. This is a probable reading, and Lightfoot derives this name from Lebba, a city near Mt. Carmel by the sea. That the genitive Ἰακώβου, which qualifies the name Ἰούδαν in Luke makes Jude the brother of James is evident. The Apostle Jude wrote an Epistle in which he calls himself the brother of James. It seems probable that so great was the fame of James the Less in the Church at Jerusalem, that persons were distinguished by their relation to him. Hence though the genitive case placed after the name of a person usually designates the parent, in this case it refers Jude to his celebrated brother, to distinguish him from Judas the traitor. Moreover, James and Joseph [Joses] and Simon and Jude are by Matthew [XIII. 55] [cfr. Mark VI. 3] called the brothers of the Lord. Now as Mary the sister of the Mother of God was the mother of James the Less and Joseph, she must have been the mother of Jude and Simon also; hence it is quite probable that James the Less and Jude were brothers.

The life of Jude is hidden in obscurity. An opinion was advanced by some that he labored in Africa, but this is rejected by the Bollandists. Joseph Assemani records in his *Bibliotheca Orientalis* that the Syrians and Chaldeans reckon Thaddæus or Adæus among their apostles. Jerome also asserts [Ad Cap. X. Matt.] that Jude the brother of James brought the Gospel to Edessa, to Abgar, of Osrhoena. This is also the constant tradition of the Greek Church, as the Bollandists prove. Many Latin writers also are in accord with it. Some have extended his labors even to Russia, but this has little proof. All the old liturgies and martyrologies record the martyrdom of St. Jude. In the Greek Menology, on the 19th day of June, we find recorded that the Apostle Jude, after preaching in Mesopotamia, came to the city Arat, and was there crucified, and pierced with darts. In the Menologium of Mena, the place of his martyrdom is assigned as Arara. In a spurious work of St. Hippolyte, Beyrouth is given as the place of his martyrdom.

Associated with St. Jude is Simon the Zealot. By Matthew and Mark, he is called the Canaanite. There are two different readings of this epithet in the Greek of Matthew. Many codices, among which are codices **Σ**, E, F, G, read *κανανίτης*;

the codices B, C, D, L, read *καναναῖος*. Luke has explained the signification of this epithet by calling Simon *ζηλωτής*, the *Zealot*. Hence, whatever be the decision regarding the Greek reading of the term, we know that it does not signify a resident of the land of Canaan, as *καναναῖος* usually signifies. Neither is it derived from the village of Cana, as some have supposed; but it is derived from the Aramaic *ܕܢܢܐ*, from Hebrew *נְנִיף*, meaning to be filled with emulation and zeal in any issue. Hence the term employed by Luke is an exact translation of the term. To explain the reason that Simon is thus termed we find two leading opinions. The first is advanced by Lightfoot, and received by Edersheim and others, that Simon belonged to the Jewish party known as the Zealots. Josephus describes the horrid designs and practices of this faction in War IV. 3, 9, 13, 14. They were fierce socialists, who, under name of zeal for the law, wrought all manner of atrocities. Of course, Simon could have been called out of this sect, as Matthew had been from the office of publican, but the account does not seem to warrant this. The second opinion, therefore, seems more probable that Simon was called the Zealot, from a peculiar zeal in Jewish observances before his call. Such was the zeal of Phinehas.—Num. XXV. 11. Paul also calls himself a zealot in the traditions of his Fathers [Gal. I. 14]; and James declared that there were great numbers of Jews at Jerusalem, who had believed, and were zealots for the Law.—Acts XXI. 20. As the cognomen was a title of honor, it is nearly always attributed to this Simon. In the Roman Martyrology, the veneration of St. Simon the Zealot is associated with that of St. Jude, and placed on the 28th of October. Baronius, in his notes to the Roman Breviary, records the opinions of those who believe that this association comes from an erroneous reading of the Codex; and they believe that the true reading should be: "Natalis Beati Apostoli Simonis, qui et Judas vocatur." The Bollandists reject this conjecture; first, on the ground that in such case, St. Jude would have no day in the Latin Church; secondly, the old Martyrology of St. Jerome distinguishes these men. For the Kalends of July it has the following notice: "In Persia, Passio Sanctorum Apostolorum Simonis Cananæi et

Judæ Zelotis." In the Greek Church, their feasts are separate; St. Simon being venerated on the 10th of May, and Jude on the 19th of June. It seems quite evident that Jerome confounded St. Simon with St. Jude. In his Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians, II. 4, he says: "We read of the eminent zeal of the Apostle Judas; not the traitor, but of him who, on account of his great zeal, was called the Zealot." Again, in his treatise defending the perpetual virginity of the Blessed Virgin against Helvidius, 13, he says: "Judas the Zealot in another Gospel is called Thaddæus." The testimony of Sophronius, a writer of the first century, as found in the "De Viris Illustribus" of Jerome, has the following: "Simon Cananæus, cognomento Judas, frater Jacobi Episcopi, qui et successit illi in Episcopatum post obitum Jacobi, cognomento justus, vixit annos viginti supra centum; crucifixus autem sub Trajano Imperatore, nata persecutione gravi, dormivit." But the error in this tradition is evident, for the data of the New Testament clearly establish a distinction between Simon the Zealot and Jude. Though contrary to the opinion of the Bollandists, it seems probable that Simon was the brother of James and Jude, and consequently one of those called the brothers of the Lord. Less is known of Simon the Zealot than of any one of the other Apostles. The general drift of tradition makes Egypt and Persia the places of his apostolic labors, and Persia the place of his martyrdom.

The last name in all catalogues is Judas Iscariot. The placing of the particle *καί* before his name in the catalogues of Matthew and Mark has a peculiar intensifying force. It expresses the horror that the Evangelists feel at the act of this one of their number. It also calls attention to the contrast between the kind, honorable treatment of Judas at the hands of Jesus, and the frightful malice of the deed in return. One of the saddest things in the New Testament is the fall of Judas. With evidence of great sorrow the Evangelists speak of him briefly. Thus also do the apostles of subsequent times preserve a certain mournful silence concerning those who have gone in the way of Judas.

Concerning the etymology of Iscariot many opinions have been advanced. Lightfoot, derives the name from *אִסְכָּרְיָא*.

According to the Rabbis, this term signified the leathern girdle or apron worn by tanners, and hence Lightfoot believes that Judas was thus called from the pocket in his girdle, in which he kept the money, or from the fact that he was a tanner.

An opinion which is now received by many derives the epithet from the Hebrew words **אִישׁ קְרִיּוֹת**, the man of Kerioth. Kerioth is a village in the tribe of Judah, mentioned in Joshua, XV. 25. Others derive the name from **יִשְׁשַׁכָּר**, the name of one of the twelve tribes. It is true some changes have been wrought in the root as it passed into the Greek epithet, but similar changes are always seen in like derivations. This opinion was hinted at by Jerome [Mald. in h. 1.], and the opinion is confirmed by other data. From Acts II. 7, it appears that the Apostles at that time were all Galileans. They were called to the Apostolate in Galilee, hence it seems probable that Judas was also of Galilee. Now placing him of the tribe of Issachar makes him a Galilean, whereas Kerioth was in Judah.

As Judas is one of the central figures in the events of the passion of Jesus, later we shall see more of him. We have only to touch here why the Lord chose this man, knowing that he was to be a traitor. Of the dispositions of heart of Judas at the time of his election, we know nothing. He may have been good or bad. God alone knows; but the question at issue is why Jesus foreknowing the treason which this man would commit chose him for the Apostolate. This question is allied to many others which are all bound up in the deep mystery of God's prescience, his permission of evil, and man's free will. God created the angels, knowing that they would fall; he created Adam, knowing that he would fall; he creates the reprobates whom he foreknows will be damned; he chose Judas whom he foreknew would be a devil. There is the mystery. But there was a providence ruling the calling of Judas. He made use of his free will to choose damnation instead of life; and God made use of his free choice to work the redemption of man through the death of his eternal Son. And again, Judas

stands there the eternal proof that the defection of the second agent shatters not the structure of the rock-built Church. Jesus chose poor and untutored men to found his Church, to show to the world that it was upheld not by human power, but by the power of his Spirit; he chose Judas to show that, even when those in the high places fall, the divine agency of salvation operating through these agencies remains unimpaired. Thus faith is confirmed by the treason of Judas. Christ foreknew that in the long ages through which the Church should endure, some of his chosen ones would betray him. Hence, to show men that such betrayal in nowise affected the divine power located in the Church for the salvation of men, he chose to allow this man to enter even among his twelve first representatives. It was a lesson to man to look beyond the creature to the power which never fails, though some through whom it works have gone in the way of the first traitor.

MATT. V. 1—10.

LUKE VI. 17—21.

1. Ἰδὼν δὲ τοὺς ὄχλους ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ ὄρος, καὶ καθίσαντος αὐτοῦ, προσήλθον οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ.

2. Καὶ ἀνοίξας τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ ἐδίδασκεν αὐτοὺς λέγων:

3. Μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι, ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν.

4. Μακάριοι οἱ πενθοῦντες ὅτι αὐτοὶ παρακληθήσονται.

5. Μακάριοι οἱ πραεῖς, ὅτι αὐτοὶ κληρονομήσουσιν τὴν γῆν.

6. Μακάριοι οἱ πεινῶντες καὶ διψῶντες τὴν δικαιοσύνην, ὅτι αὐτοὶ χορτασθήσονται.

7. Μακάριοι οἱ ἐλεήμονες, ὅτι αὐτοὶ ἐλεηθήσονται.

17. Καὶ καταβὰς μετ' αὐτῶν ἔστη ἐπὶ τόπου πεδινοῦ, καὶ ὄχλος πολὺς μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ, καὶ πλήθος πολὺ τοῦ λαοῦ ἀπὸ πάσης τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ Ἰερουσαλὴμ καὶ τῆς παραλίου Τύρου καὶ Σιδῶνος, οἳ ἤλθον ἀκοῦσαι αὐτοῦ καὶ ἰαθῆναι ἀπὸ τῶν νόσων αὐτῶν.

18. Καὶ οἱ ἐνοχλούμενοι ἀπὸ πνευμάτων ἀκαθάρτων ἐθεραπεύοντο.

19. Καὶ πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος ἐζήτουν ἅπτεσθαι αὐτοῦ, ὅτι δύναμις παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐξήρχετο, καὶ ἰάτο πάντας.

20. Καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπάρας τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ εἰς τοὺς μαθητάς αὐτοῦ ἔλεγεν: Μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοί, ὅτι ὑμετέρα ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ.

8. Μακάριοι οἱ καθαροὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ, ὅτι αὐτοὶ τὸν Θεὸν ὁψονται.

9. Μακάριοι οἱ εἰρηνοποιοί, ὅτι αὐτοὶ υἱοὶ Θεοῦ κληθήσονται.

10. Μακάριοι οἱ δεδιωγμένοι ἕνεκεν δὲ καιοσύνης, ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν.

1. And seeing the multitudes, he went up into the mountain: and when he had sat down, his disciples came unto him:

2. And he opened his mouth and taught them, saying;

3. Blessed are the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of Heaven.

4. Blessed are they that mourn: for they shall be comforted.

5. Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth.

6. Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness: for they shall be filled.

7. Blessed are the merciful: for they shall obtain mercy.

8. Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God.

9. Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called sons of Gods.

21. Μακάριοι οἱ πεινῶντες νῦν, ὅτι χορτασθήσεσθε. Μακάριοι οἱ κλαίοντες νῦν, ὅτι γελάσετε.

17. And he came down with them, and stood on a level place, and a great multitude of his disciples, and a great number of the people from all Judæa and Jerusalem, and the sea coast of Tyre and Sidon, who came to hear him, and to be healed of their diseases;

18. And they that were troubled with unclean spirits were healed.

19. And all the multitude sought to touch him: for power came forth from him, and healed them all.

20. And he lifted up his eyes on his disciples, and said: Blessed are ye poor: for yours is the kingdom of God.

21. Blessed are ye that hunger now: for ye shall be filled. Blessed are ye that weep now: for ye shall laugh.

10. Blessed are they that have been persecuted for righteousness' sake: for theirs is the kingdom of Heaven.

In the first verse of Matthew, Tischendorf edits the text, *προσῆλθον αὐτῷ*. The *αὐτῷ* is omitted by Codex B, and is considered doubtful by Westcott and Hort. The beatitude concerning the meek is placed in the fourth verse by Tischendorf and such is the reading of D. Such order is also sustained by the Vulgate, by the Syriac of Cureton, and by Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Ammonius, Eusebius, Gregory of Nyssa, Basil, Hilary, Jerome, et al. But the order is transposed, and the beatitude concerning those who mourn is placed first in **Σ**, B, C, E, K, M, S, U, V, Γ, Δ, II, et al. Such order is also followed by the Peshitto, Coptic, Armenian, and Ethiopian versions, and it is endorsed by Chrysostom, Tertullian, and by the critics Westcott and Hort. In the ninth verse of Matthew *αὐτοί* is omitted by **Σ**, C, D, and by Tischendorf.

In the seventeenth verse of Luke the reading *ὄχλος πολὺς* is found in **Σ**, B, L, 1 and 118. Such reading is followed by the Peshitto Syriac, and is endorsed by Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort.

Though some have denied that these texts are parallel, yet we believe that the context proves them to be so. The text of Matthew is fuller than that of Luke, but such variations are often discovered in parallel texts. Both texts have the same general argument, the same beginning, the same ending. And in both Evangelists, we find that after the discourse, Jesus came down to Capharnaum, and healed the centurion's son. More absurd still is the theory of those who believe the sermon on the mount to be made up of sayings of the Lord uttered at various times, and here woven together by the Evangelists. It is true that the Lord did teach some of these truths at various times in his life; but all things point to the fact that here solemnly and *ex professo* he promulgated the great ethical code of the spiritual life. The verses from seventeen to nineteen inclusively of Luke have been explained in the events which preceded the call of the Apostles. In making one and the same the passage in Matthew and Luke, we find a difficulty in this

that, according to Matthew, the Lord ascended into a mountain to deliver his discourse, whereas according to Luke, he came down out of the mountain into the plain. To harmonize these accounts, we shall first set forth what seems to have been the real order of the events, and then we shall endeavor to find that same order in the two Evangelists. Clearly from the preceding data, we find that the Lord bade his disciples pray that the Lord of the harvest might send laborers into his field, and that then he withdrew from them, and went up into a mountain to pray. All seems to warrant that the disciples spent that same night on the mountain slope, not far from the Lord. Thus on the night preceding Calvary, he bade Peter, Andrew, James, and John pray, and then withdrew a little from them to pray alone. The prayer on the mount seems to have been in some respects similar. And in the morning, Jesus came to the disciples, and chose the twelve, and, with these twelve and the other disciples, he came down from the higher portions of the mount to the point where the multitudes were waiting.

The traditions of the East place the event on the slope of the mountain which is called by the Arabs Koroun Hattin, *the Horns of Hattin*. It is so called from the two extremities of the elevation which rise to a slightly greater altitude, which a vivid Eastern imagination likens to the horns of a beast. The mount itself rises to the northwest of the Lake of Gennesaret, to the altitude of about fifty metres above the plain below. It was on this site that the famous battle was fought in 1187, which put an end to the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem. Guy de Lusignan, king of Jerusalem, was encamped here, when the Crusaders were surrounded by the hordes of Salah-ed-Din, and cut to pieces. The mountain top stretches out into a beautiful plateau bounded at its extremities by the two elevations called the horns, and here is the traditional site of the sermon on the mount, and it is called the Mount of the Beatitudes. Luke has followed the Lord up from the crowds into the mountain; Luke records the event of the calling of the Apostles; and Luke records the Lord's descent again to the multitude. Matthew hastening to come at the discourse itself, passes over the night on the mount and the election of the twelve, and connects the going up into the mount with the great discourse

delivered on its side. The point of departure is the same, and the conclusion is the same; only there is a considerable lacuna in Matthew. The peculiar expression in St. Matthew: "And opening his mouth," is only the Hebrew form of expression to denote the beginning of a grave and important discourse. The address was delivered immediately to the disciples, though it was intended for the multitudes, and, in fact, for all men in all ages. But the Lord had now formed his school, and it was his design to teach the world through them. Hence Luke writes: "And lifting up his eyes upon his disciples, he said," etc.

The Lord was seated during the discourse, as we learn from St. Matthew. Pondering over the great problems which rule human destiny, his eyes had been cast down. He raises them, and fixes them upon the disciples, to communicate to them these great thoughts. They were spoken for the world, and through the Apostles they have come to us, and they have in them the grand science of eternal life.

In the discourse, the Lord does not divide the "blessed" up into different classes, but brings out in concrete form the temper of mind and the great virtues of the real servant of God. The signification of *μακάριοι*, *blessed*, as used here by the Lord is of men who possess the real good. The human heart naturally aspires to happiness. The whole course of humanity's thought and endeavor is after good, either real or fancied. The world stands before man and calls one way to the acquisition of good; the Lord Jesus calls in an opposite direction. Hence, in the very opening of his discourse, he directs the aspirations of man to the real good.

The signification of "poor" here is not merely that of men who are not avaricious, but of men who hold the world and creatures at their real worth; and for whom Heaven is a reality. There is a difference in the text in the use of the term "poor." Matthew employs the terms *πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι*, *the poor in spirit*, whereas Luke has only *πτωχοί*. Inasmuch as we believe that one and the same discourse is recorded by both men, we must hold that the same idea is contained in the terms used by both Evangelists. The Hebrew term used by Matthew may

have been עניים, which the Greek translator rendered πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι. We have only therefore to bring out the specific force of the word "poor."

In classic Greek πτωχός meant a beggar, one who crouches and appeals for alms. In later Greek, it came to mean in general a poor man. The possession of property is of itself an indifferent thing. There are poor men and rich men in hell; poor men and rich men in Heaven. Therefore certainly Christ did not proclaim a man blessed simply because he was a pauper. On the other hand, we are far from believing that the Lord put into this term the idea of humility; the term employed must refer to the non-possession of wealth. Now God is a spirit and must be worshipped and served in spirit. Therefore the grand and central idea of the term is the spirit of renunciation of the goods of earth, which idea should be in men's minds. God would dethrone the god of wealth from the mind of man, and reign there himself. Therefore the spirit of renunciation is the essence of this beatitude. It may be found in a man who actually possesses many possessions, but it is rarely so. Money begets the love of money, and the greed of getting fastens itself on the possessor of property. And in no age is this truer than in our day. It is an age of lawless independence of thought, of confidence in material things, of love of mere sensuous beauty, of aversion to pain and self-denial, of belief in physical means to remedy the world, without the forgiveness of sins and the regenerating grace of God. As these agencies especially operate in the actual possessor of wealth, the Lord, in a certain measure, identifies the actually poor man with the man poor in spirit. In all the beatitudes, there is a strong contrast between the actual state of man and its future reward. So here to those who have no possessions here on earth is promised the greatest of possessions, the kingdom of Heaven. Now it is well to get an exact idea of the state of man which Christ here beatifies, and then tend towards it with the soul's best energy. It is natural to man to wish to possess something, to attach something to himself that he can call his own. That tendency shapes his life. If he constitute the object of that natural tendency in money and what money represents, he ranges himself in the

opposite class to those mentioned in the first beatitude. No matter if he actually possess nothing, his mind is taken from God and the things of Heaven, and given to creatures, which he desires to have, and as far as God is concerned, he is with the rich. Of course, the actual possession of that which he craves would confirm him in his love of creatures, and bind him farther still away from God.

But if a man directs that natural tendency and wish to possess something to the acquisition of the inheritance of Heaven; if he considers goods and possessions of earth as transitory things, to be prudently used in accomplishing the deeds of virtue; if he esteems himself to be worth what he is worth before God; if he esteems the attachment to wealth a fetter to the feet of the Heavenly pilgrim; if he considers human life an exodus through a country that is not his, and in which he builds no permanent habitation, but only tents for rest in the way; if his face is towards the Land of Promise, and his eyes fixed upon that city which is from above,—then is he in the class here beatified by Christ, even though he possess wealth. But in the great majority of cases, if he possesses wealth, he will not be of that temper of mind just described. Wealth creates wide-spreading interests, and the soul that is taken up with these issues ordinarily does not give to God that portion of human life which is God's due. Possessions are mere accoutrements, and the tendency of wealth is to identify the accoutrements with the man. Man leaves the accoutrements at the grave,—“there are no pockets in shrouds”—and God receives only the man freed from these appendages, and often a very poor man from out of rich accoutrements. You can not thrust gold into God's hands. This beatitude does not conflict with thrift and industry, and honest traffic. To labor and save, to provide a respectable position in society for one's self and dependents, is a virtue, and compatible with this beatitude, provided the goods of earth be held in their true worth. But it is more perfect, like St. Francis, to renounce all possessions, and live in perfect detachment from creatures. That is the highest perfection of the beatitude; down from that extend the degrees of the virtue until we come to the man who begins to *settle down* in the things of earth. There the line of demarcation

begins, and continues down to the man who clutches his bonds and bills, and pressing them to his lips says: "These are my god." Neither would the well-being of society be endangered, if all men became as St. Francis. The creation of fancied needs would be taken away, and the earth would give all her children food and raiment.

It is harder to be poor now than in former times; the contrast is greater. The wild wish of all to stand on the same plane engenders a discontent unknown in the earlier ages of the world. Man's life *on earth* is ever and ever brought into more prominence, with a resulting adverse reaction on the life of the spirit. As material comforts multiply, and money's power is increased, man fastens himself more than ever to the passing things; "the better things" appease not this growing hunger of the human heart. The love of God, and the eternity of life are not half as real to such as "that money will buy money's worth, and that pleasure is pleasant"; and the gospel of Mammon operates against the Gospel of Christ; and fools are lured to death by the glitter of gold. Other ages may have had more corruption than ours, but there never was an age colder and more selfish; there never was an age in which there was so much reflected in man's life the error that man's life begins and ends here. The mind of man has been active from the beginning in making this world a comfortable place to live in; he has succeeded, and now it is hard to quit it all, and go.

Christ addresses these beatitudes to his disciples in the vocative case, because he took them as living representatives of the doctrine he taught, and they had even then left all things and followed him.

The second beatitude in the fifth verse of St. Matthew's text corresponds to the second part of verse twenty-one in the text of Luke. The world calls happy those who have its goods, who enjoy its joys, who are free from its pains. It is the happiness which the eye of the world sees, and approves, because it looks not beyond the present life. But that worldly enjoyment is subversive of the reign of Christ in a man. When a man possesses much of the world in any form, the world is very apt to possess a corresponding part of the man; and God is excluded. Success, power, riches, pleasure are the prices paid by

the world for the souls of men. Wolsey turned to God only when he fell; Napoleon forgot God at Austerlitz; he came back to God at St. Helena. Worldly joy dulls the spiritual sense in man, and fastens him to the earth. God has established but one way to the perfection of life, and that is by conformity to the life of Christ, and Christ was a man of sorrows. Those who are borne on by the current of worldly pleasure live on the outside of their lives; they live only in the passing moment, and forget God. But the man of God must be a man of thought, must be a man who is ever striving to do his share of life. And such a man must mourn. He must mourn that he is a member of a fallen race, which can only be redeemed by suffering; he must mourn that the land has been accursed for sin, and that the thought of man is prone to evil from his youth; he must mourn that he is an exile in a land of sin, where the clamor of sin ascends daily before God; he must mourn in thought of the price of redemption paid by Jesus to redeem him; he must mourn at the state of man invaded by temptation and the consequences of sin; he must mourn for his offences against God, for man's ingratitude; in a word, a man filled with the right thoughts of Heaven must mourn that he is still a creature of earth, and that he can only reach a better state through death, whose thought is always bitter. But this mourning is by no means melancholy and low-spiritedness. It is simply that religious soberness of mind which places in just proportions what man's life is, and what it is to be. This religious mourning must not be confounded with that earthly grief over the loss of some earthly good, or the non-possession of some worldly possessions. The mourning of the beatitude is that of the Blessed Virgin, from her close association with her divine Son; it is the grief of St. Paul in his lonely voyages for the cause of Christ, in his prison, and his grief for his people; it is that of the saints who hid their lives with the Redeemer and lived his life. This religious sorrow is lit up by the divine sustaining hope, and thus there is mingled with it a happiness truer and better than any creature can give. The saints of God are always cheerful and happy, but their joy is centered in a good not yet attained; and this very looking forward to the object of their lives engenders a certain sad realization of the

sorrows of their present lot. We judge also that there are included in this class those chosen souls whom God has tried by affliction and pain in this world, and who have borne it with calm resignation.

In the biographies of the elect of God sorrow and affliction have always played a large part. In fact, the Lord has mapped out such a life for his elect. The woman in the Apocalypse, being with child, cried travailing in birth; and in pain to be delivered. Thus in affliction does the Church beget her children. To all such is promised a consolation which surpasseth all knowledge. The perfect fulfilment of this promise is in Heaven, as it is stated in the Apocalypse XXI. 4: "And God shall wipe away every tear from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away." And Isaiah saith: "As one whom his mother comforteth, so will I comfort you; and ye shall be comforted in Jerusalem." But this perfect fulfilment in Heaven does not prevent a certain participation of the divine comforting even in this life. And in the first place the sustaining and comforting grace of God is always available. The source of sorrow may be allowed to endure, but this consolation of grace so fortifies the mind that it can rejoice as Paul rejoiced in many tribulations. We might truthfully say that the certain hope of the inheritance in the kingdom of Heaven is the earthly phase of the consolation here promised; the fruition of that highest good is the consummation of that consolation in Heaven. When, therefore in prophecy, Christ is predicted as a consoler, it is to be understood that the present consolation consists in his promises, which he will fulfill in Heaven. Mary, the Mother of God, mourned when she stood beneath the cross; a sword pierced heart. She is comforted now by the eternal presence of God to whom she is closest of all creatures.

Of course, this best gift can only be perceived by those, who have the kingdom of Heaven within them.

At times also the Providence of God, acting in conformity with his high wisdom, consoles even by taking away the causes of human sorrow, but this is not the main thought. There is

nothing on earth of such worth that it could justify these solemn words of Christ.

In Matthew's list the third beatitude has regard to the meek, the *πραῖς*. This term seems to correspond to the עֲנָיִים of the Hebrew. This word always conveys the idea of affliction, trial and oppression, and of a gentle, meek toleration of these evils. From the nature of human life, the man who would be meek and gentle, must practice non-resistance to evil. In the clash of interests, and the strife for the goods of earth, the rights will be invaded of the one who will not contend to repel by similar means the encroachments of greed; and hence the word rightly includes in its sense the meaning of meek long-suffering of evil.

As a nation we are not characterized by this virtue. We are all more or less influenced by the drift of popular thought, which holds that it is characteristic of a noble, brave soul to revenge every offense and repel every adversary. This is the code of the world, especially of our world. An American is born with the idea that he holds no dependence on God or man. Here also is the code of Christ opposed to that of the world. Meekness opposes to the "whips and scorns of time, the oppressor's wrong, the proud man's contumely," gentleness and patience. But meekness is of still grander import. It fortifies the mind, even in prosperity, to gentle forbearance; to the pardoning of personal insults; to the mild, courteous exercise of power; to tender condescension to those of inferior station. And even in afflictions that come not from our fellow mortals but from the higher powers it bends the heart to patience, and to cheerful resignation. It moves men to endure the difficult qualities of soul in those of different temperament and tastes. It enables a man to bear a wrong patiently; to endure to be misunderstood and undervalued; it expels the cruel thought of revenge from the soul, and breaks down the barriers which hinder the entrance of the Spirit of God in the soul.

These virtues are not found alone. We can not find a man possessing in an eminent degree one of these beatific virtues, but devoid of the others. They are allied and interwoven, so that one merges into another; in fact, they are but different manifestations of the one grand virtue of godliness.

We may gather from clear passages of Scripture the importance which God gives to the virtue of meekness. In Ps. XXV. 9, [Vulg. XXIV.] the Lord promises a special providence to the meek: "The meek will he guide in judgment: and the meek will he teach his way." Again in Ps. LXXVI. 9, [Vulg. LXXV.], it is declared that "God will arise in judgment to save all the meek in the land." In Ps. CXLVII. 6, [Vulg. CXLVI.]: "The Lord lifteth up the meek; he casteth the wicked down to the ground." Psalm CXLIX. 4 declares "that the Lord will exalt the meek unto Salvation." In Ps. XXXVII. 11 [Vulg. XXXVI.] it is declared, "that the meek shall inherit the earth, and shall delight in the abundance of peace." In Ps. XXII. 26, it is said: "The meek shall eat, and be satisfied." Isaiah XI. 4, thus proclaims the special regard that the Redeemer hath for the meek: "But with righteousness shall he judge the poor, and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth," etc. And according to Zephaniah's prophecy, IX. 9, "the Lord came to Sion, meek and riding upon an ass, and upon a colt the foal of an ass."

By meekness a man says to God: "I am weak and poor, do thou answer for me." It is a true cry, and it enlists the power of God in our behalf. All the promises of the New Law find their adequate fulfilment in Heaven. So here the land that is promised to the meek is not any temporal possession, but the richness of the inheritance of Christ. In the Old Law virtue was encouraged by temporal concessions from God, and in that economy the land promised was Palestine. But this was only a type of the better promises made to us by Christ; and in that perfect code, all things tend towards Heaven for their perfect fulfilment. But this permits also that the arm of the Lord should be extended at times to help the meek even in this life. God does never give his best gifts to his saints in this life; but, at times, when his wisdom judges it opportune, he stretches forth his hand even to those of the Church militant, but the fulness of the promise is an inheritance in the abiding city of Christ. The opposition between the ways of God and the ways of the world is observable also in this beatitude. The worldling is forever contending lest some one will violate his rights, and take from him that which he claims as his own;

he contends with others, and strives to exclude them from some coveted possession. The meek man does none of these, but suffers patiently even the invasion of his rights, and clamors not when by unjust methods he is excluded from place or possession. In a worldly sense it would seem that he was losing all; but God is there, and will give him back for the things which in meekness he renounced, a rich inheritance in the kingdom of Christ. The endeavor to acquire this virtue will bring with it the other virtues. In one detail of life the specific exercise of one virtue will be called for; in another detail, the exercise of another; the aspiration of man should embrace them all; so that when his summons comes, he may stand before his God vested in all these virtues, one of the noblest works of God. Appropriate to this theme are the words of St. Chromatius: "Man can not be meek, unless he first become poor in spirit. Out of riches and worldly cares arise lawsuits, quarrels, contentions, hatred, bitterness without end; and amid these, how can the mind be meek and gentle, except it cut off by renunciation the causes of anger and strife? The sea becomes not calm, unless the winds cease; a fire cannot be extinguished that is fed with inflammable material; thus the mind will not become meek and peaceful, unless those things which disturb it are cut off. Well therefore does the Lord join state to state; for the poor in Spirit thence begin to be meek."

The fourth beatitude in the sixth verse of Matthew seems to correspond to the first sentence of the twenty-first verse of Luke. The Lord was not certainly speaking of mere natural hunger in Luke, but of that hunger which has a religious basis. Now if we give a religious motive to the words of St. Luke they become of like import to those of St. Matthew. Hence as Matthew has the fuller expression of the truth, we shall fix our minds on the exposition of his words.

One of the mightiest propensities of man is the desire for food and drink. As these are necessary for the conservation of the individual, nature proclaims her need by a powerful impelling force, which in its different manifestations is the strongest incentive to human action. Here this natural propensity is used in a metaphorical sense to denote the intensity of man's longing for that disposition of soul that

makes man a friend of God, and gives him a right to an inheritance with Christ. The object of the hunger and thirst here can in nowise be natural bread and drink, as Maldonatus has led many to believe. The Greek construction makes the *δικαιοσύνη* the direct object of *πεινῶντες* and *διψῶντες*. Hence the thing meant by *δικαιοσύνη* must be the object of the hungering and the thirsting. Now *δικαιοσύνη* in Scriptural use, means the state of righteousness. It means the possession of the qualities which God demands in the soul of man. Hence it signifies that faith, hope and charity be lodged deep in the breast, that the man be free from mortal sin, and in a state of grace. As the soul of man becomes purified and informed by the grace of God, a great longing springs up in the soul to possess supernatural wealth. The things of earth reveal themselves to such a soul in their true littleness. The divine within man will not be satisfied with such husks. It longs to be something truly good and great; and to possess something that is really good. That which is really good is righteousness here, and the vision of God hereafter; hence there arises that hunger which Christ here beatifies. By development, this can come to absorb all the energies of a man's being; and then a man will say with Paul: "I live now, not I, but Christ liveth in me." This supernatural hunger is not in those men who aim at doing only what is necessary; and who try to find out how little will be enough; who thirst not for the living God, but for the prizes of this life; and who are scanty in supernatural acts. But it is of those who feed on the thought of the Lord and his reward; who see him in all things; and amid the cares, interests, and pursuits of this life, reserve the best part of their hearts for him, as a sanctuary where the profane world has never entered. The hunger and thirst after righteousness is not different from the hunger and thirst after the fruition of God, for they both proceed from one motive, viz., the love of God, drawing the desires of men away from baser things, and fixing them on the real good. Such a mighty yearning was in the heart of the Psalmist, when he cried: "My soul thirsteth for God, for the living God: when shall I come and appear before my God?"—Ps. XLII. 2. And again: "O God, thou art my God; early will I seek thee: my

soul thirsteth for thee, my flesh longeth for thee in a dry and thirsty land, where no water is My soul followeth hard after thee: thy right hand upholdeth me.”—Ps. LXIII.

The various events of such a man's life are weighed and ordered only in their relation to the supernatural life. At least, that is the perfect state of such a life, and the lower degrees are ranged in the measure that they approach that grand ideal. The human heart fashioned by its Creator must have in it aspirations which rise above the things of earth. In the man beatified in this class, all these aspirations are developed and fixed on their proper object; they form a grand purpose of life, an incentive to action. This begets an interest in one's real destiny; the man feels that he is called to be something, and to do something. The taste of this food is sweet, it sharpens the hunger; and thus the supernatural hunger grows; the taste for baser food is dulled; we feel that we possess something of immense value; we wish more of it; we are willing to do hard things to come a little closer. With every degree of progress, the hunger for this grand perfection of our being grows. And therefore say the Scriptures of God; “They that eat me shall yet hunger: and they that drink me shall yet thirst.”—Eccli. XXIV. 29.

The man hungering for righteousness is in strong contrast to the ordinary man of the world of our day. Even for the believer, in these days, Heaven is somewhat of an abstraction. Every day the world moves farther away from the supernatural. Society is but faintly sensible of the great truth, that man has but one duty in this life, that is to prepare for eternity. The positive effort of life is given to securing wordly advantage; religion often receives merely a negative part in our thoughts and deeds. When our hearts are not in our work, and we are but carried on with the stream of the world, continuing in the Church because we find ourselves there, observing religious ordinances simply because we are used to them, we are not hungering and thirsting after righteousness. But the man who is hungering and thirsting after righteousness is moved to positive deeds, not spasmodically, but daily. His religion is not of routine, but an abiding personal religion, which regulates his thoughts, words, and deeds, according to the law of God.

And those chosen souls, who keep themselves from the lusts of the world, who live in the perpetual realization and desire of the great life of man, when they are met by some great temptation to overcome, or something hard to do, they have a source of energy from which to draw.

The road which leads to life everlasting is, in the main, a difficult one. To continue persistently therein, one needs a strong and earnest desire to attain that state into which the road leads. If that desire be a mere matter of routine, one will be easily diverted from the straight and narrow path by sensible goods scattered along its borders. A man, moving along in the Christian way, without this intensity of desire, will do the easy things of religion well enough, but will fail when confronted with the greater temptations, or when called to perform some act that entails a sacrifice. Wherefore the Lord judged it wise to set right this fundamental desire; for “*unumquemque trahit sua cupido.*” Actual hunger of the body will often come into the lives of those who are hungering and thirsting after righteousness. First, there will be the voluntary hunger and thirst of those who chastise their bodies and bring them into subjection by abstinence from that which the belly craves. Then there will be the hunger which follows as a natural consequence upon the renunciation of worldly goods. And to all these it is promised that they shall be filled. The actual possession of the *summum bonum* will content the eternal longings of the human soul made in the image and likeness of God, and then will be fulfilled that which is written: “They shall be filled with the fatness of thy house; and thou shalt make them drink of the torrent of thy pleasure.”—Ps. XXXVI. 8.

The fifth beatitude in the seventh verse of Matthew corresponds to the thirty-sixth verse of the VI. Chapter of Luke. The quality of mercy grows out of the love of the neighbor; it is, in fact, but a special manifestation of love. It is a tender, compassionate movement of the heart, in which the actual or impending suffering of our fellow being is taken into the heart, and made a motive of forgiveness or benevolence.

Mercy has always been regarded as one of the grandest attributes of man. This attribute is manifested in two special

ways. First it moves a man to forgiveness of injuries and offenses, when the power is given him to exact punishment for them. No man can be God-like without being merciful, for mercy is above all the other attributes of God. "And the Lord passed by before him and proclaimed: The Lord, the Lord God, merciful, and gracious, long-suffering and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin."—Exod. XXXIV. 6, 7. "But thou art a God ready to pardon, gracious and merciful, slow to anger, and of great kindness."—Nehem. IX. 17. "For I knew that thou art a gracious God, and merciful, slow to anger and of great kindness."—Jonah IV. 2. "And David said unto God, I am in a great strait: Let me fall now into the hand of the Lord, for very great are his mercies."—I. Chron. XXI. 13. "Let thy tender mercies come unto me, that I may live, for thy law is my delight."—Ps. CXIX. 77. "The Lord is gracious, and full of compassion; slow to anger, and of great mercy. The Lord is good to all; and his tender mercies are over all his works."—Ps. CXLV. 8, 9. "It is of the Lord's mercies that we are not consumed, because his compassions fail not. They are new every morning: great is thy faithfulness."—Lamentations III. 22. "O give thanks unto the Lord; for he is good; for his mercy endureth forever."—I. Chron. XVI. 34. The chief theme of the Psalms is the multitude of the mercies of the Lord. "All the ways of the Lord are mercy and truth, unto such as keep his covenant and his testimonies."—Ps. XXV. 10. "For thy mercy is great even unto the heavens and thy truth unto the clouds."—Ps. LVII. 10. "For thy mercy is great above the heavens: and thy truth reacheth unto the clouds."—Ps. CVIII. 4. Every one of the twenty-six verses of the one hundred and thirty-sixth psalm closes with the declaration: "—for his mercy endureth forever." Again the Psalmist declares: "I will sing of the mercies of the Lord forever."—Ps. LXXXIX. 1.

The Psalmist has exhausted the power of language to extol the mercies of the Lord. He has made them higher than the heavens, and as enduring as eternity.

Now the perfection of man is in becoming like his Creator. He was made in God's likeness, and bidden become perfect,

even as God is perfect. We have seen what place mercy has among the attributes of God; let it have a corresponding place among man's qualities of soul.

The second manifestation of mercy is in relieving suffering. God wishes all humanity to be bound together by bonds of love and brotherhood. Now this is impossible, unless man is moved to compassionate and relieve human suffering. It is only a narrow, selfish heart that can look on unmoved at the sad spectacle of human misery and distress. The truly Christian heart is always a large heart, a heart of large sympathies. If we could place a goodly number of such men throughout the world in the different places of human life, the whole life of man would be bettered and raised. For one strong good man exerts his influence upon those of a considerable radius about him.

A powerful inducement to be merciful is laid down in the beatitude. A proportion is proclaimed between our dealings with our fellow mortals, and God's dealings with us: the merciful shall obtain mercy. Nowhere is this proportion more forcibly enunciated than by St. James, II. 13: "For judgment without mercy to him that hath not shown mercy; and mercy exalteth itself above judgment." It is plainly there said that God will deal with man after the manner in which man has dealt with his fellow man. Even more, the second member says that the mercy that a man shall have done in life will enter in, and turn away the judgment of God due for other transgressions. And yet the judgment of God remains true, for the worth of mercy is so great before God that it turns away his indignation; it draws down his richest graces; and finally, in the marvellous ways of God's dealing with the soul, it succeeds in actually triumphing over the judgments of God. Let, therefore, the man who shuts up his heart from his suffering brother, and looks on unmoved at the sorrows of man, remember, thus shall the Lord deal with him in that dread day, when we shall all need mercy. In many ways is this grand precept broken. It is broken by every hard and selfish thought that harbors in the heart of man. It is broken whenever human misery is made the means of personal advantage or gratification of revenge. It is broken when we fail to do what

is in our power to relieve the wide-spread suffering in our land. And this relief should tend to relieve both the moral and physical ills of mankind. It is broken by him who, in remembrance of an offense, hardens his heart against a man in need; it is broken by the man who squeezes his large percentage of profit out of half-paid operatives; it is broken by the man who takes the price of bread from the drunkard and his family, and deals out therefor the drunkard's bowl. It is the lusts of the world that choke up the avenues to mercy; for when a man rises above the earth, and begins to breathe that purer, spiritual atmosphere, there come into his heart softenings from Heaven, and his heart expands to receive God, and to pity humanity for the love of God. Of course, it needs not be said that the proportion between the mercy which God will show and the mercy which man shows, is the proportion of analogy. As God's nature is above that of man, and God's power above the power of man, so will God's retribution be above the comprehension of man. Neither is that blessed retribution restricted to the future life of man; it is participated even here in rich graces, visible and invisible benefits, and God's comforting love, even in this life. A man should make the practical resolve from these considerations to show mercy in large degree to every man; to grow in mercy, and to make his life serviceable to others.

The sixth beatitude in the eighth verse of Matthew has no explicit parallel in Luke. Men differ in explaining the sense of these words. Schegg and others interpret them of the specific virtue of chastity. St. Augustine, Bede, Rhabanus Maurus, Chrysostom, Menocchi, Lamy, Schanz and Maldonatus understand by the cleanness of heart, the simplicity of heart of those who are innocent and guileless. But by far the greater number of authorities interpret the words of the generic virtue of freedom from grievous sin. This is the opinion adopted by all the Fathers and writers, except the few cited for the aforesaid opinions; and, indeed, it is practically certain. All sin is a defilement, a staining of the heart. The affection for sin defiles and renders foul the desires. It was a defect of Pharisaic teaching to limit all religion to outer religion. Now the religion of Christ is pre-eminently an *inner* religion. This

religion calls for the cleaning out from the heart of man of every species of pollution. This is based on Christ's clear teaching. "But those things which proceed out of the mouth come forth from the heart; and they defile the man. For out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies: these are the things which defile a man."—Matt. XV. 18—20. But to say that a man is clean of heart, says more than that merely these crimes are not in his life. It says that they are not in his affections; that his mind has a horror of them; that it shrinks away from any approach to them. It says that a man's heart is right before God; that his thoughts are upon things pleasing to God; that his desires are upright and honorable. Christ is commending here that inner love of everything pure and good which refines the heart; which causes it to loathe moral defilement; so that not only is sin shunned for fear of the punishment, but because it conflicts with the refined spiritual tastes of the heart. To these is promised the vision of God. As in the other beatitudes, so here this fulfilment is perfected in Heaven, but yet it finds a partial verification here. As we are pleased to be in the society of people of refined and virtuous thoughts, so the Creator draws near to those pure souls who keep themselves unspotted from the world. He makes his presence known not by sensible vision, but by subtle, wondrous revelations to the soul. We know by that mysterious inner consciousness that he is near, and that we are in his love. By this cleanness of heart, the spiritual perception of the soul is fortified; it can not unlock the mysteries, but it sees enough of God's ways to draw it to have faith in him, and to love him. In fact, there is a direct proportion between the cleanness of heart and the spiritual understanding of the soul. The greater the cleanness of the heart, the more penetrating the vision, both in this life and in the life to come. Every moral defilement is a disease weakening the powers of the soul. Now the soul that is gross and carnal in its thoughts and desires is especially weakened in its spiritual vision, so that in the words of Paul: "The animal man receiveth not the things of the spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them because they are spiritually discerned."—I. Cor. II. Hence it

was the intention of Christ to proclaim the affinity that exists between clean, refined hearts and the pure essence of God. That quality of their being binds them nearer to God in this life and in eternity. That quality raises man in the scale of being; it removes him farther from the life of the brute, and closer to the life of the angel; and insures to him a closer personal society of God. When a man, therefore, feels that God has receded from him, and that his hold on the supernatural is slipping away from him, it is vain to appeal to the mere power of intellect to find God again. Let man purify his heart, and God will come back to him, and bring with him faith, hope, and love. And again, it is vain for a man who is seeking Christ to expect to bring himself by the mere force of intellect into the true fold. If man would set about and purge his heart from all uncleanness; and then humble himself, and ask for faith, the Father would draw him to Christ.

God loves peace. One of the chief characteristics of the kingdom of the Messiah is peace. Whatever violates peace violates the order of the universe. The harmony of all things with each other, and of the whole with God is peace. The state of Heaven is peace; the state of hell is eternal discord and chaotic disorder. Now the state of Heaven is always in some degree reflected in the lives of the truly good; hence does the Saviour commend the peacemakers. In many places in Holy Scripture, God is called the God of Peace. Peace is the normal condition of God and of all his creatures. When peace is banished from anything, it is in a state of fever. Its faculties are impaired, and it can not give that glory to God that was intended in its creation. The preservation of a state so essential to the well-being of all things, is an important factor in God's Providence over the universe. Thus saith Paul: "God is not the author of confusion, but of peace, as in all the churches of the saints."—I. Cor. XIV. 33. God is the author of peace, and those who move with him will be authors of peace. They will carry out on earth the designs of God. This unanimity of purpose and action will produce a likeness of nature, so that they shall merit to be called like to God, the sons of God. For as God operates to preserve peace in

the universe, so they in their several spheres restore and preserve peace. All the elect are the sons of God, and it is not the intention of the writer to classify by themselves the peacemakers, but to represent vividly the excellence of the virtue by placing after it that particular phase of the state of the elect to which peacemaking corresponds in nature.

The Greek term is not *εἰρηνικοί*, but *εἰρηνιστοί*, the peacemakers. Therefore it imports more than mere existence in a peaceful state; although that is good, and included. But the term means an active endeavor to put down discord and contentions, and reduce all things to peace. On a clear serene day, we can see a great way up into Heaven's blue, but when the sky is overcast, and the storm rages, and the elements are in contention, that clearer view of Heaven is shut out. So it is in the soul of man, peace keeps down all tumult, that man may hear the voice of God; peace clears the moral atmosphere, that the vision of the eye may stretch upward to God. Strife undoes it all, and shuts out the influence of Heaven from man's life. This peace is not to be confounded with apathy, and moral stagnation. It is a peace that is at the same time active; that takes a keen interest in everything that affects the better life of man; it is a peace that is tranquil in believing, because it has come at certainty through the grace of God and the obedience of faith. It is a peace like to the peace of the Son of God, intense in action, but gentle, unobtrusive. Great effects are not produced by noise and contention. The action of God should be the norm of all action, and God moves all things in peace.

Now God desires peace in every department of human life; peace in the home, peace in society, peace in the Church, peace in the State. Every man is invited to promote that peace in a degree commensurate with the place which he fills in the world. But it is especially in the domestic and social relations of man that the blessing of peacemaking is intended here by the Lord. "An even, unvaried life is the lot of most men, made up of commonplace events, commonplace interests, and we are apt to despise it, and get tired of it, and to long to see the world." We think such a life affords no great opportunity for bringing out the grand ideals of Christ. "To rise up, and go through

the same duties, and then to rest again, day after day,—to pass week after week, beginning with mass on Sunday, and then to our worldly tasks,—so to continue till year follows year, and we gradually get old,—an unvaried life like this is apt to seem unprofitable to us, when we dwell upon the thought of it. Many indeed there are who do not think at all; but live in their round of employments, in the dull routine of their circumscribed lives, without care about God and religion, driven on by the natural course of things in a dull irrational way like the beasts that perish.” But the man who feels that he has a soul, and a work to do, and a reward to be gained, greater or less, according as he improves the talents committed to him, then he is naturally moved to be anxious to do something unusual, and he asks: What must I do to please God? “Sometimes he is led to think he ought to be useful on a large scale, and goes out of his line of life, that he may be doing something worth doing, as he considers it. The life of the Blessed Virgin, and the lives of the Saints assure us that we need not give up our usual manner of life in order to serve God; that the most humble and quietest station is acceptable to Him, if improved daily,—nay, affords means for maturing the highest Christian character.”

Now indeed there is danger that the uneventfulness of life, and the monotone of life may engender spiritual insensibility. Men’s souls are influenced by that which exists around them, and full often we find that men’s souls have become like their environment, dull and small. This, of course, comes from looking at the world with worldly eyes, and from a lack of soul-culture. The way to change it is not to take the man out of his way of life, but to bring into his soul the true idea of the truly good and great things of life. The true greatness of human life is not the magnitude of worldly achievement; indeed that is in reality a mere bauble, deceptive and worthless. The true greatness of human life does not consist in the depth and range of intellectual perceptions; for what is all the knowledge of all men compared to the knowledge of God? But the greatness of human life consists in the bringing of Heaven into the life of man; it consists in suffering and

humiliation for a moral end; it consists in making the great end of life things which the world reputes as of no worth, reputes as the foolishness of the Cross.

This being so, it is possible for a man to make his life sublime in the narrowest environment. God's estimate of things is the exact reverse of the world's estimate. The things which the world esteems great, God esteems little; and the things which the world esteems little, God esteems great. And God's estimate is the only true one. Thus a man working for the world may logically complain of the narrowness of his life, but in working for Heaven, the position in life is indifferent. The materials for eminent sanctity are in every Christian life. There is good to be done in every life, and God asks that man take it up and do it.

So the man who would long to enroll himself among the Lord's peacemakers needs not go outside his line of life. Let him preserve peace in his home; and, amid the thousand natural shocks that domestic life is subject to, let him by counsel and command, by deed and noble example, promote peace. This will often require strong moral courage, to bear the asperities of the various members of the household. God does not exact of us that we effect the disarmament of Europe, but he does ask of us, that we establish the peace of God in the circle of our daily lives.

Now the great disturbers of domestic peace are stiffness in maintaining our own opinion, selfish attention to our wants and comforts, obstinacy in following our own will, and lack of fortitude to bear trials with patience. It is nobler in the mind to suffer with equanimity the troubles of ordinary life than to rush to death in battle. Such evenness of temper shows a soul that is in possession of itself, and having the right appreciation of virtue. The peacemaker will not only preserve peace amid the asperities of life, but he will promote it in others. People often quarrel, and become divided by misunderstanding. Something happens, is misconstrued, and both parties feel indignant. This indignation prevents them from coming together to obtain a right understanding of the matter. The paths of their lives diverge. It is easy thereafter for each to see the other's actions in their worst light. And thus the breach

widens, and the bond of perfection is sadly broken. Now if the peacemaker comes upon the scene, with a wise counsel and prudent appeal to the better elements of both, he is able to take away the error, and bring back these lives again into harmony. There is much potentiality for good in man that continually goes to waste for the lack of some kind counselor to bring it into act.

Again, there is merit before God for the peaceful disposition of the heart, even though occasion were wanting for it to manifest itself in outward action. Man judges of the properties of things from the nature of the actions which come under the observation of human faculties. One judges of man's heart from his external actions; man can not read the heart itself. But with God it is otherwise. God weighs in their just value the dispositions of the heart; he knows the potential good in us, and the potential evil; he knows our fortitude in standing fast in virtue, even before we are tried; and he knows our weakness, even while we are in a present state of virtue. And so it is with the virtue of peacemaking. If the whole interior man is in a state of peace with man and with nature, this is the fulfilment of the beatitude, even though no great occasion present itself for calling forth this quality of soul.

And again, in the ordinary neighborly intercourse of man with man, the peacemaker has a fruitful field. Much of the evil of human society is caused by the litigious spirit in man. This is especially true in Americans. We are over-jealous of our personal rights and liberties. Often is it verified that the real motive in a *litis-contestation* is simply the gratification of a vindicated right. If the litigants were asked for an opinion on the excellence of the beatitudes, they would readily assent to the beautiful doctrine, but the truth is assented to without making any due impression on the heart. What society needs is not more courts and lawyers, but more peacemakers.

As we study the great ethical code of these beatitudes, and then look out upon the world, and see such a faint reflection of it in the ordinary life of man, we might be tempted to think that the message of the Lord had been too sublime for man, and had failed by having contemplated an ideal man, and not man as he is. This would be to mistake the scope of the Gospel.

Christ never promised to reform the world as the world. He offered to reform man by taking him out of the world. For this cause Paul saith: "For our citizenship (*πολίτευμα*) is in Heaven; from whence we look also for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ."—Phil. III. 20. It is vain therefore to look for the grand ideal of Christ in the man of the world. Look for him in those chosen souls who keep aloof from the spirit of the world. These souls will never constitute the great bulk of mankind. It is a mystery that the spirit of the world has the many, and God has the few.

Carlyle called it a tragedy that one man should die ignorant, who had capacity for knowledge. Is it not a greater tragedy that a man having capacity for God and immortal life should lie like a beast, sleeping the sleep of the world, and while the "body stands so broad, and brawny, the soul should lie blinded, dwarfed, stupefied, almost annihilated?"

Of course, these beatitudes have their degrees. In *some* degree they must be found in every soul that shall see salvation; in their fullest degree they are found only in a few grander spirits, who follow Christ more closely, and who continually look upward, and discern their celestial home

Man should be ever conscious that within him is a Prometheus bound, struggling to be free. The divine in man is hemmed in, and fettered by this solid flesh of ours. "For the corruptible body is a load upon the soul, and the earthly habitation presseth down the mind that museth upon many things."—Wisdom, IX. 15. And the result is that many men "live as though man were but a patent digester; and the belly with its adjuncts were the grand reality." In such men, we find not the fulfilment of the ideal of the beatitudes. Let him therefore who aspires to bring into his life this great teaching, not waste his time in bootless sighing for impossible things; let him apply the code at once to the ordinary affairs of domestic and social life. Hast thou in thy own home by kind word and patient yielding, and prudent counsel, stilled the tempest of hearts, and calmed the rising passions of wrath and discord? Thy deed is known in Heaven; thou art a peacemaker of Christ. Hast thou come between thy contending neighbors with kindly offices of charity and reconciliation? Hast thou

driven out the spirit of hatred and revenge from the meanest human bosom? Hast thou in any measure, or in any way made men hate each other less, and love each other more? Hast thou when reviled, offended, and wronged, kept thy soul in a state of peace, being content to commit thy cause to God who knoweth the secrets of hearts? If thou hast done this, or if thou wilt do this, be of good cheer; thou art enrolled in the army of Christ under the standard of the Cross.

The opportunities of peacemaking meet us at every step of life's journey. Every life has its storms, and needs its peacemakers. And they to whom strength of mind, and talents, and education have been given should use these gifts to smooth the rough and crooked ways in the lives of those who have received less.

A valuable office of the peacemaker may be illustrated as follows: Some friend or acquaintance comes to us, and relates something received from a fellow mortal which has moved him to indignation. The nature of the thing received may be various, calling for various treatment. In the first place, it may be a positive certain injustice and wrong. In such case, there is no profit in trying to convince the person that the thing is justifiable. He knows that it is not, and whatever effect our counsel might have upon him for the moment, the remembrance of the wrong would surge up, and cancel it soon afterward. The first thing therefore to do is to induce the person to a cool review of the fact in all its bearings, being careful to show the person that you are not eager to weaken his side of the question. Such treatment begets confidence, and the person will reveal all that is necessary for a true understanding of the case. In such dispassionate review of a fact, many things will come out, which, when explained properly, will lessen the anger of the contestant. The next thing to consider is the subjective state of the person; whether he will stand the perfection of the law which is of counsel, or whether the most to be hoped is the preservation of that which binds under precept; and the advice given will vary accordingly. Then we must examine whether the state of the case, permits a recourse to law. There are, of course, cases where the injustice is great and plain, but circumstances make a recourse to judicial

settlement profitless to the individual. In such cases, such procedure is to be dissuaded; for the gratification of the spirit of revenge may never be made the motive of a suit in law. In such cases, the weakness of human law will still intensify the person's anger, and the only availing motive to calm the distressed soul is to induce him to lay his cause before God, the true Judge of man. It is marvellous how this thought will temper the wild thirst for the avenging of injuries. The mind wracked by the flaws and errors, and delays in human law can be made to rest calmly on the knowledge that God's justice is sure, and his judgments true. It is a maddening thought that no one can be made to see the justice of a man's cause. To impress on such a one that God sees the justice of it, and that in his own time, he will render full justice, takes away the madness from a mind in which God holds a place. But in a case which calls for a process of law to render justice, it will be the office of the peacemaker to keep the mind from hatred and thoughts of revenge, even while justice is sought in the courts. This will be, of course, difficult, especially in rude minds.

A state of hatred in the mind is often due to a certain confusion of the person of the offender with the act of offense. The offense is evil, and no power can make us love it; and we are apt to look at offender and offense "*sub uno respectu.*" What we really should do, and move others to do, is to look back of the offense to the person of the man bearing the image of God in his soul, for whom Heaven was made, and Christ was born. But in the great majority of cases, we shall find that the gravity of the offense exists only in the imagination of the offended. In these cases, we have only to show forth the true nature of the action, moving the offended person to a benign interpretation of all doubtful features of the same, and bringing into strong relief the redeeming features. Of course, all must have a basis of truth; for if we overdo the plea for the offender, our whole argument will be doubted and rejected. And throughout it all, the leading thought must be that we are not called to love the personal qualities of man, nor man in himself considered, but as he is a creature of God; that is, we are called to include him in that grand act of love that centers in God.

A frequent source of bitterness and strife among mortals is the circulation of damaging reports. In this class of evils often the effect produced is much greater than enters into the mind of the one who circulates the report. As the nature of a thing is brought into stronger relief and better known by some examination of its opposite, so we may come at a better knowledge of the value of peacemaking by some reflections on the phase of trouble-making known as detraction. The detractor is the exact opposite of the peacemaker. As the microbes and bacilli spread disease, so the evil tongue spreads discontent, contention, and strife in communities. God is the author of peace, and the peacemakers are his agents; Satan is the author of hate and strife, and the detractors are his agents. Back and forth they operate between individuals and families, and pour the poison of hell into hearts; and foster the worst passions of the human breast. Always the worst is transmitted, and the imagination is called in to dress up the report, and make it startling. Detraction is pre-eminently the vice of people of low intellectual status, and its ravages are especially prevalent in the homes of the common people.

The duty of the peacemaker regarding these reports is manifold, yet plain. In the first place, it is his duty, when an evil report comes to him, to work that which in him lies to suppress it, and to endeavor to impress the detractor with the baseness of his action in circulating the report. But it is especially with the injured party that the office of the peacemaker is effective. Some one comes to us and relates that a certain person has circulated an evil report about him. The heart is swollen with resentment and anger. Now many a one will make answer: "Yes, I heard that, and such and such other things that the same individual said of you." But the peacemaker begins softly to speak of good things which the aforesaid individual has said of the offended party; of certain neighborly acts rendered; of evidences known to himself of the esteem in which the offended party is held by the aforesaid neighbor. Then the magnitude of the offense is reduced to its proper dimensions, the palliating features, are brought out, the lack of malice, and the thoughtlessness of the utterance; perhaps also it will be possible to insist on the uncertainty of

the information. But even in the case of the blackest and most malicious detraction or calumny, there is always the example of Christ to which to appeal to soften all offended hearts.

Joining the tenth verse of Matthew with the preceding, some have contended that there are here promulgated eight beatitudes. This is the more common opinion, and is embodied in catechetical instructions among English Catholics. Tostatus and others limit the number to seven, chiefly because the reward here indicated is not specifically different from that in the first beatitude. The whole discussion is vain. The idea of numeration was certainly not in the Lord's mind. Neither was it his purpose so to individualize these beatitudes that they might be numbered as distinct quotations. He had not in mind to give seven truths, or eight truths, but all truth; and naturally these truths intertwine and merge into one another. The numeration is a human invention to aid the mind to seize and retain the doctrine, and we believe that the number eight serves best for the purpose. As the doctrine of the tenth verse of Matthew is expanded and developed in the subsequent verses, we shall expound its sense in the exposition of the following texts.

MATT. V. 11—16.

11. Μακάριοι ἐστε ὅταν ὀνειδίσωσιν ὑμᾶς καὶ διώξωσιν καὶ εἰπωσιν πᾶν πονηρὸν καθ' ὑμῶν ψευδόμενοι ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ.

12. Χαίρετε καὶ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε, ὅτι ὁ μισθὸς ὑμῶν πολὺς ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς: οὕτως γὰρ ἐδίωξαν τοὺς προφῆτας τοὺς πρὸ ὑμῶν.

13. Ὑμεῖς ἐστὲ τὸ ἅλας τῆς γῆς: ἐὰν δὲ τὸ ἅλας μωρανθῇ, ἐν τίνι ἀλισθήσεται; εἰς οὐδὲν ἰσχύει ἔτι, εἰ μὴ βληθὲν ἐξω καταπατεῖσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

LUKE VI. 22—26.

22. Μακάριοι ἐστε, ὅταν μισήσωσιν ὑμᾶς οἱ ἄνθρωποι, καὶ ὅταν ἀφορίσωσιν ὑμᾶς καὶ ὀνειδίσωσιν καὶ ἐκβάλωσιν τὸ ὄνομα ὑμῶν ὡς πονηρὸν ἕνεκα τοῦ Υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

23. Χάρητε ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ καὶ σκιρτήσατε: ἰδοὺ γάρ, ὁ μισθὸς ὑμῶν πολὺς ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ: κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ γὰρ ἐποίουν τοῖς προφῆταις οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν.

24. Πλὴν οὐαὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς πλουσίοις, ὅτι ἀπέχετε τὴν παράκλησιν ὑμῶν.

14. Ὑμεῖς ἐστέ τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου: οὐ δύναται πόλις κρυβῆναι ἐπάνω ὅρους κειμένη.

15. Οὐδὲ καίουσιν λύχνον καὶ τιθέασιν αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν, καὶ λάμπει πᾶσιν τοῖς ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ.

16. Οὕτως λαμψάτω τὸ φῶς ὑμῶν ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὥπως ἴδωσιν ὑμῶν τὰ καλὰ ἔργα καὶ δοξάσωσιν τὸν πατέρα ὑμῶν τὸν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

11. Blessed are ye when men shall reproach you, and persecute you, and say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake.

12 Rejoice, and be exceeding glad: for great is your reward in Heaven: for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you.

13. Ye are the salt of the earth: but if the salt have lost its savor, wherewith shall it be salted? it is thenceforth good for nothing, but to be cast out and trodden under foot of men

14. Ye are the light of the world. A city set on a hill cannot be hid.

15. Neither do men light a lamp, and put it under the bushel, but on the stand; and it shineth unto all that are in the house.

25. Οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, οἱ ἐμπεπλησμένοι νῦν, ὅτι πεινάσετε: οὐαὶ οἱ γελῶντες νῦν, ὅτι πενθήσετε καὶ κλαύσετε.

26. Οὐαὶ ὅταν ὑμᾶς καλῶς εἴπωσιν πάντες οἱ ἄνθρωποι, κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ γὰρ ἐποίουν τοῖς ψευδοπροφήταις οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν.

22. Blessed are ye, when men shall hate you, and when they shall reject you from them, and reproach you, and cast out your name as evil, for the Son of man's sake.

23. Rejoice in that day, and leap for joy: for behold your reward is great in Heaven: for in the same manner did their fathers unto the prophets.

24. But woe unto you that are rich! for ye have received your consolation.

25. Woe unto you, ye that are full now! for ye shall hunger. Woe unto you, ye that laugh now! for ye shall mourn and weep.

26. Woe unto you, when all men shall speak well of you! for in the same manner did their fathers to the false prophets.

16. Even so let your light shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father who is in Heaven.

In the eleventh verse of Matthew, *ρῆμα* is added after *πονηρόν* in C, E, K, M, S, U, V, Γ, Δ and Π. It is also found in the Syriac versions, and is endorsed by Origen. In the thirteenth verse of Matthew, we find the reading *βληθέν* in *ℵ*, B, C, 1, 33, and in some codices of the Philoxenian Syriac. The greater number of authorities favor the reading *βληθῆναι*.

In the twenty-fifth verse of Luke, *νῦν* is added after *ἐμπεπλησμένοι* in *ℵ*, B, L, Q, R, X, Δ, and Z. In the twenty-sixth verse, most of the authorities add *πάντες* before *οἱ ἄνθρωποι*.

In the life of man there are two contrary forces forever in action. Both are powerful, both have their motives, and both have their followers. Between these forces there is an essential enmity. The one is the spirit of the world, which makes man a creature of the earth; shapes his life in conformity with the ideas which regulate the life of worldings; makes him a *persona grata* to the powerful ones of earth. The other is the Spirit of God, which moves man to renunciation of earthly goods; which moves man to despise the false philosophy, and the false principles of the earthly man for God and truth.

These two spirits divide humanity into earthly men and heavenly men; and between these two classes there is a conflict. The power of the earth, and the fat of the earth have always been chiefly in the hands of the earthly class. Such things constitute the prize that the spirit of the world gives in return for the service of immortal souls, and many follow. This spirit comes close to us; it is entrenched in every department of human life; it makes use of all the show and pomp, and pageantry. It labors in every plane of man's life to eliminate the supernatural, and enthrone the natural. Man is by nature a fallen being; and to follow the spirit of the world, all that he has to do is to give up, and flow with the mighty tide of human life. To go with the Spirit of God means renunciation and combat; it means to do things that nobody else is doing; it

means to do at every step what man naturally hates to do; it means to cast our lot with the few, and forego comfort and ease, and to make our future mode of being, of which we know so little, more real than this sensible warm life which we love. Hence it is verified that the many and the powerful are arrayed on the side of the spirit of the world, and these have always persecuted those who followed not the world's mode of thinking and the world's mode of doing. This has been the history of man from the beginning. The impious Cain slew the pious Abel. Abraham was compelled to go out from his own people and from his own possessions in order to serve God. The unfaithful Ishmael harrassed Isaac; the impious Esau hated and sought to kill Jacob. The brethren of Joseph conspired against his life. Pharaoh and his hosts oppressed Israel; the Israelites themselves turned against Moses; Saul sought the life of David. The persecution of the early prophets may be learned from the soliloquy of Eliah: "And he said: I have been very zealous for the Lord God of hosts: because the children of Israel have forsaken thy covenant, thrown down thy altars, and slain thy prophets with the sword, and I, even I only, am left, and they seek my life to take it away."—I. [III]. Kings, XIX. 14. It was no light persecution that drew from the man of God such a bitter plaint. The prophet Micah prophesied the truth to the impious Ahab, and was therefore smitten in the face, and cast into prison, sorely afflicted and reserved for death. Jeremiah prophesied the truth to the princes of Israel, and because he would not fill them with false, vain hopes, they smote him, and cast him into prison. They sought power from the King to kill him: "Then they took Jeremiah and cast him into the dungeon of Malchiah the son of Hammelech, that was in the court of the prison: and they let down Jeremiah with cords. And in the dungeon there was no water, but mire; so Jeremiah sank in the mire."—Jer. XXXVIII. 6.

It is a well founded tradition with Jews and early Fathers that Jeremiah was sawn in twain by a saw by command of the impious Manasseh.

Of the persecutions of the saints of the Old Law Paul discourses in Hebrews, XI. 37—38: "They were stoned, they were sawn asunder, they were tempted, they were slain with the

sword: they wandered about in sheepskins and goatskins; being destitute, afflicted, tormented; of whom the world was not worthy. They wandered in deserts, and in mountains; in dens and caves of the earth."

A terrible persecution fell upon the faithful of Israel under the Seleucidæ. Now Christ looking forward, and foreseeing that the life of his Church would be in persecution, animated his followers to fortitude and perseverance by the example of the heroes of old. As his discourse was primarily intended for his Apostles and disciples, he brings into especial prominence what the lives of the prophets had been. They were called to succeed into the place of the prophets, to make head against the same spirit of the world, to speak God's truth fearlessly; and they were to expect the same treatment at the hands of the world. And they received it. The story of the first three centuries tells of the mighty conflict between the exponents of the law of Christ and the spirit of the world. The Christians were hated by men; the name of Christian was an emblem of reproach and reviling. And those heroes of old actually did rejoice, and were glad in the midst of persecution; for they looked forward to Christ and his reward.

The qualification that the Evangelists record here is plain. Luke says that the persecution must be for Christ's sake; and Matthew says that, to be meritorious, it must be falsely put upon us. To suffer persecution for crime places not a man in this blessed class. These evils must, as Matthew says, be borne for the sake of righteousness, which he afterwards explains to be borne for the sake of the Lord. Hence St. Peter saith: "But let none of you suffer as a murderer, or as a thief, or as an evil-doer, or as a busy-body in other men's matters. But if any man suffer as a Christian, let him not be ashamed; but let him glorify God for this cause."—I. Pet. IV. 15-16.

It is evident that Christ is here not merely exhorting to perseverance through persecution, but predicting a state which, in various degrees, has always been the life of the Church.

Some explain the *name* of which Christ speaks, in saying that men would cast out their *name* as evil, to mean not the proper name of the individual, but the name of Christian, by which his followers were to be known. Though this is

supported by the authority of able commentators, we prefer to understand thereby the individual name of the several ones. The name of a man is a symbol of the man, and its hearing calls up an idea of the man in the human mind. Christ signified that so intense would be the world's hatred, that any symbol that called up the idea of his followers in the minds of their persecutors would be hated, and its very sound would stir the soul with deep disgust. This opinion includes the former; for it says that every appellation by which men would designate his followers would be hated by men.

The Lord not only exhorts to patience in these trials and persecutions, but even bids them rejoice and be glad. Now these words plainly mean that Christ's followers should be more pleased to receive persecution than to receive its opposite. This is impossible for the natural man. It is impossible for the indifferently good man. And yet it is the only logical position for a Christian.

The error with many Christians is that they never receive into their souls the fullness of the truths of Christianity. They receive a certain smattering of half understood truths, and hold feebly to these, at the same time that they go largely with the world. The world has no difficulty in placing its inducements before men; they are in our own corrupt nature, and in everything we see; but Heaven's inducements only reveal themselves to the soul that has purified itself from the grosser things of earth; and hence they are often neglected and ignored. Now the Christian code demands things of a man that he will not do without an inducement; and Christ holds out this inducement in the great reward in Heaven.

Erroneous theorists have attacked the goodness of actions done for reward. In fact, the doctrine of the service of God for hope of reward is almost exclusively a Catholic tenet. That the doctrine is supported by clear Scriptural authority, is sufficiently proven from this passage, but we have cumulative evidence for the same doctrine in the Psalter, in Paul's Epistles and in other portions of Scripture. Man has an obligation to pay heed to all the Lord's words, and very often in Scripture is the hope of reward held out as an inducement for man's service. It would be absurd to hold out to man this hope, if it were

wrong for man to make of it a motive of action. And in the present text, and in many other declarations of the Lord, the hope of reward is made the very foundation of man's Christian life. Catholic commentators cite in proof of the Catholic doctrine verse 112 of Ps. CXIX. [Vulg. CXVIII.] which stands thus in the Vulgate: "Inclinavi cor meum ad faciendas justificationes tuas in æternum propter retributionem." The Hebrew original does not justify this reading. According to the aforesaid original, it should read: "I have inclined my heart to perform thy statutes forever, even unto the end." Hence, there is no proving force in the arguments drawn from the Vulgate reading of this text. But we do not need this text. The great hope that animated Paul in his great life was the hope of reward. He fills his hearers with that same great hope. He appeals to the example of "Moses who esteemed the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures of Egypt, for he looked forward unto the recompense of a reward."—Heb. XI. 26.

The error of those who reject the service that looks forward unto a reward is that they falsely believe that the respect of a reward detracts from the love of God. This is not so; for God himself is the essence of that reward. God has prepared a blessed state of existence for man, in which man is to enjoy the vision of God, and a state of transcendental happiness with God. It is God's will that man should strive to attain this, and God holds it before man amid the heavy sorrows of earth. The appreciation of felicity, which is God's gift, detracts nothing from the giver, but intensifies our love for the Supreme Good; for the reason that he is good to us. To endeavor to love God, even though he were oblivious of us, and had nothing for us, is to endeavor to conceive an impossible concept. God would deny his nature, if he were not good to the being into whom he had placed a capability and longings for the vision of God. And any thought that contemplates changing the nature of God is impossible and vain. Man is asked to love God, as he is the Supreme Good and rewarder of man. In this concept, God and his reward are combined in the same order that they exist in his own divine nature; and the act is possible and good. Any other conception is impossible to man and

a vanity. It would be as reasonable to ask one's self, if one would be willing to go to hell to avoid sin. The concept deserves no answer, because it implies a contradiction, and is unthinkable.

The second term here used by Luke to express joy in persecution is *σκιρτήσατε* from *σκιρτάω*, which properly means to spring, to leap, to bound. It indicates a great degree of joy, which is often manifested by such movements. The true life of the Christian can not be understood by the world. These are especially the days of half men and half Christians, and not much heed is paid to this divine exhortation. Man would rejoice in such manner, if he made a million, or received a high office, or rose to fame. These are the realities of earth, and the earthly man rejoices in their possession. Now faith makes the possessions of Heaven equally real to the heavenly man, and he rejoices in their possession. As the very pushing forward to the things of God involves a persecution, and as persecution is the best test that we have broken away from the spirit of the world, and are following the Spirit of God, so does the Christian rejoice in persecution, to which is attached a corresponding reward. This is only possible for the man who lives in Heaven, and who counts his wealth by what he has stored up there, and rejoices in its accumulation. Filled with this spirit, Peter and John, when beaten for the cause of Christ, "went forth from the presence of the Council, rejoicing that they were accounted worthy to suffer shame for his name.—Acts, V. 41. Sustained by the same hope, the martyrs went forth intrepidly and gladly to die for Christ.

The prophecy contained in the words of Christ was literally fulfilled in the lives of the Apostles, and of all his first followers. It has been fulfilled ever since in the life of the Church, and in greater or less degree in the lives of her individual members. The peace which came to the Church under Constantine was soon after broken by Julian the Apostate. He was succeeded by the Arians, who enlisted the power of the State against the members of the true faith. As the Church spread to other lands, she encountered the opposition of the spirit of the world, and the words of Christ were fulfilled in the lives of her teachers and her children. The mighty wave of Islamism swept over

the East, and setting in Westward threatened to submerge Christianity. The Church was allowed to suffer but not to die. And then the great Apostasy broke out, and marshalled all the elements peculiarly worldly against the old Church. Protestantism rejects "blessings, and absolutions, the intercession of Saints, the grace of the Sacraments; and in great measure the prospect of the future life. Protestantism essays to make a man respectable, and leave him on earth. It is the religion of the worldly-minded. It casts out the real presence, because it is too supernatural. Protestantism is Pelagian; it appeals to the native pride in man, it falls back on the heathen virtues of our original nature. It places respectability above faith, and refinement above the law of God." The protestant with "closed affections, and haughty reserve, and dreariness within, falls back upon his worldly integrity, honor, energy, prudence, and perseverance." Protestantism makes the most of the natural man; and the world has rewarded it. Protestantism has the wealth, and the power, and the refinement, and it looks down with pity and disdain on the ignorance and vulgarity of the Catholic Church. The world persecutes not protestantism, because protestantism is but a refined form of the spirit of the world. "This life holds out prizes to merit and exertion. Men rise above all their fellows; they gain fame and honors, wealth and power, which we call worldly goods." Protestantism approves these. It fosters the thought that the natural man may follow society with its social ranks, and aims, and pursuits, and pleasures, and prizes, and still serve Christ. Hence it gathers under its standard those who shrink away from an intensely supernatural religion. The words of Christ have been ever true of the position of the Church with the world. They are true to-day. In every country in the world, the Church suffers the invasion of her rights, and an oppression by the worldly forces. In most cases, her members are chiefly of the despised class. The pride of intellect insults her, and laughs at her ordinances; the power of the State wrongs her; the influence of wealth and worldly position is pitted against her. The forms of persecution change, but the fixed enmity between the Church and the world's forces, in some form, endures. Now when a man would leave the world's

camp, and go over to the Church, he must do more than merely assent to some truth that he had formerly not received. He must change his whole life. This is a hard thing to do. Hence full conversions are not frequent. Protestantism allows to a man the pride of intellect; he may follow his own bent in religion. Catholicity demands the obedience of faith to mysteries and to authority. "Protestant refinement teaches a man to politely seek his own; Catholic refinement moves to renunciation."

But it is not alone in the great life of the Church that persecution prevails, it must be also in the lives of individuals. In some form or other those who follow the principles of Christ must incur the persecution of the world. The words of Christ are corroborated by the words of Paul: "Yea and all that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution."—II. Tim. III. 12. In order to keep in harmony with the world, one must use the world's methods, and as these are forbidden to the Christian, there arises a conflict. The spirit of the world, acting in the first ages, hunted the Christians to death; the spirit of the world, acting in England and Ireland, tore from the people property, civil rights, and even life itself. The spirit of the world, in our own country, wrongs the Catholic people, and discriminates against them in some of the blessings which should be insured by every form of government. Persecution is the criterion by which a man is known as Christ's.

But a man may say: "I hold fast to Christ, and I experience no persecution." True, but let him look closer, and he shall find that it is because he is forever making compromises with the spirit of the world. "We fall into the many conventional modes of wrong-doing so easily. They do not shock the moral sense of the community; we come to move in the thought of the world. One after the other, we surrender principles of Christ's faith, and adopt the easier theories of the world, till our religion becomes the religion of the day, and this entails no persecution. The religion of the day takes the brighter side of the Gospel,—its tidings of comfort, its precepts of love; all darker, deeper views of man's condition being comparatively forgotten. This is the religion natural to a civilized age, and well has Satan dressed and completed it into

an idol of truth. As the reason is cultivated, the taste formed, the affections and sentiments refined, a general decency and grace will, of course, spread over the face of society quite independently of the influence of Revelation. That beauty and delicacy of thought, which is so attractive in books, then extends to the conduct of life, to all we have, all we do, all we are. Our manners are courteous; we avoid giving pain or offense. The love of the beautiful and the rule of expediency supersede conscience, and the sin which is out of taste is avoided. The awful mysteriousness of religion, the inflexible justice and wrath of God are explained away out of religion. Everything is bright and cheerful. Religion is pleasant and easy, benevolence is the chief virtue."

To prevent the religion of the day from becoming dull, it must receive modifications from the ever accommodating discoveries of science. Preaching must be *alive*. The religion of the day has no place for St. John of old preaching: "My little children, love one another." "Hence excitements are eagerly sought out and rewarded. New objects in religion, new systems and plans, new doctrines, new preachers, are necessary to satisfy that craving which the so-called spread of knowledge has created." Now this religion of the day is Satan's counterfeit of the religion of Christ. "It has no true fear of God, no hatred of sin, no humility, no change of heart, no firm adherence to doctrinal truth. It is a religion which cultivates the intellect without disciplining the heart. The men of the day have not gone to the authority of God to seek what religion is, but they have made a religion of their own, after the manner of what they thought religion ought to be." Man's duty is not sought in the will of God, but in what the canons of society call elegant. The whole theory of the fall of man and the necessity of grace, of the wrath of God, and the eternity of hell has become unpopular, and it is set aside. Man is invited to have large views on human nature, to insist on the brotherhood of man. The world has fallen into what St. Bernard calls a "*maledicta securitas*," a "cold, self-wise, self-sufficient tranquility." Deep contrition for sin is not a feature of the religion of the day. Sins are forgotten, and conscience sleeps. Such, in part, is the shallow creed of the day, popular because it

puts no obstacle in the way of following the prizes of this life, but rather heightens the enjoyment of the present visible system of things. On the stage of human life we see believer and unbeliever move side by side; we see them engage in the divers affairs of human life; and we should never be able to tell who was the Christian, and who the unbeliever from their conduct of life. The Christian weakly holds to those elements of his creed which do not conflict with his worldly interests; it is first the world and success in life, and then religion in a mild form for leisure moments. The world persecutes no such man. But when a man, like the Baptist of old, squares everything with the law of Christ, then no matter what his station in life, the world will persecute him. If he be a laborer, the world in the form of the secret society will persecute him to force him into their ranks, that he may be able to sell his labor. It will persecute him in hatred of his faith, and call his intensity of faith bigotry. It will persecute him in his observance of the precepts of the Church, and call it superstition. He will lose many advantages that the spirit of the world holds out, because they can only be attained by the sacrifice of principles that he will not let go. The spirit of the world laughs at the father of a large family, and calls him a fool because he will not subvert one of the basic laws of the universe. The toiler who will not engage in the obscene conversation of his fellows is unpopular. If he is wronged, and adopts the non-resistance of the Gospel, he is dubbed a coward. Men wrong him, because he will not strike back, nor appeal to the arm of the law. It is a strong man who has the moral courage to kneel down and say morning or evening prayer when observed. The man in business must lie and cheat in a hundred conventional ways or suffer in competition with those whose law is the spirit of the world. The professional man is moved in multifarious ways to make compromises with the spirit of the world.

The words of Christ do not signify that in the life of the Christian there should be ever present an actual persecution, but that the trend of the world is opposed to the trend of the life of the Church and her children, and that their opposing interests and purposes will always more or less clash. It is easy to see the verification in the life of the Church. In the

lives of her individual members, there will be times in which the persecution takes not on a specific form, but in every life which passes through the ordinary span of earthly existence, and adheres closely to the principles of belief and conduct of Christ, there will be times of actual persecution suffered for Christ's high law, and the more active the elements that separate the Christian's life from the life of the world, the more exposed is he to the fiercer attack of the spirit of the world in its Protean forms.

St. Luke balances the doctrine by placing in antithesis the destiny of the worldly man. He proclaims woe to the rich, to those that are filled, to those that laugh, and to those who have the praises of men. The words are not to be taken in their bald literalism, but in the light of the context, and according to the analogy of faith. In proclaiming woe to the rich, Christ is simply completing and corroborating the first beatitude. When a proposition is true, its contrary must be false. The doctrine of the first beatitude is true; it denominates the elect of God; hence its contrary must denominate those who are not the elect of God, and their destiny is proclaimed in the woe addressed to them. What Christ here condemns is not man's possession of property, but property's possession of man. He condemns not the philanthropic, charitable rich man whom we may conceive in our thoughts, but the concrete rich man as we find him, and as every age has found him. It has been well said of man that he is "a vulture flying through this world, and looking for something to eat, and shrieking dolefully because carrion enough is not given him." The possibility is in man's nature to have riches and not trust in them, to consider the goods of the world as intrusted to man's stewardship, to be wisely applied to relieve suffering, and promote the welfare of society. Upon such a rich man the denunciation falls not. But where shall we find such a rich man? Considering man's nature as he is, there is a close connection between the having of wealth and the trusting in wealth, and hence the terrible words of the Saviour mean that the possession of wealth is a calamity to the Christian, and that its general tendency is inconsistent with the state of salvation.

The state of the Christian in its highest form consists in renunciation; its middle form adapted to ordinary Christian life is expressed by Solomon: "Give me neither riches nor poverty; but supply me with that which is needful and sufficient." And in the following verse, Solomon gives the reason: "Lest I be full, and deny thee, and say: who is the Lord; or lest I be poor and steal, and take the name of my God in vain." For the man of strong faith and great love of God, the state of voluntary poverty is the best, but for the man who lives in the middle plane of the Christian life, sufficient property for comfortable livelihood affords the best state for Christian life. To strive by honorable means to have this, does not place man in the class condemned here by Christ; at the same time that the higher state is held out to those who are strong enough to bear it. When a man is in great poverty, he is apt to become sullen and discouraged. A certain feeling of moral irresponsibility is apt to come upon him, and he may become oblivious of the dignity of his manhood. He will not think of Heaven, while his children are ragged, his home cold, and he and his family hungry. Hence, while teaching the great spirit of renunciation to all, we have need to inculcate thrift and frugality to those of the humbler walks of life, not as a slight evil that we must tolerate while living here, but as a positive virtue befitting their state of life. Therefore the spirit of poverty must pervade all Christians, and even those who are exhorted to save their earnings are to be taught their transitory character. The words of Christ invite to a state which insures the highest moral development of man, which ranges between strict renunciation and the possession of a competence. The rich man who serves God well is an exception to his class, and as an exception, he emerges from the woe pronounced against the rich by Christ. It is very difficult to be this exceptional rich man. So difficult indeed is it to possess wealth, and hold our course Heavenward, that the Lord in another place uttered these dreadful words: "Verily I say unto you that a rich man shall hardly enter into the kingdom of Heaven." And again: "I say unto you, it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God."—Matt. XIX. 23, 24.

The whole tenor of the New Testament is in praise of poverty, and in condemnation of riches. St. James indeed declares that the election of God regards the poor: "Hath not God chosen the poor of this world rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom which he hath promised to them that love him?"—Jas. II. 5. When we see certain people of wealth leading respectable lives, and faithfully attending divine worship, and engaging in philanthropic work; and see on the other hand the vulgarity, and the narrowness of soul, and the coarse tastes, and perhaps the coarser sins into which poverty has plunged a man, we may be disposed to believe that the words of the Lord must be taken with a certain latitude, and that perhaps all that was intended was a general counsel against excessive covetousness and avarice. This is erroneous. In commending poverty, the Lord had regard to the state considered in itself, and he by no means commended all who might be in that state. But the state itself is consistent with the law of the Gospel; and in itself, it offers no obstacle to the perfect law. If sins are committed in poverty, they are not committed as a resultant of the state itself. Of course, the vast majority of the world's population is poor, and the elect are few, so that a man may not fall back on his mere poverty as a title to salvation; but he can regard such state as in itself consistent with the highest perfection. Now as regards the state of the wealthy, the very state is a hindrance to the service of God. A man in such a state must continually battle against a powerful tendency of the most deadly character, which springs from the very state itself. If outward respectability were religion, then it would be well with the rich, but God is the searcher of hearts. The vices of the poor appear to all; we judge according to appearance, and we condemn them. Gold hides the vices of the rich. Wealth becomes a substitute in man's heart for God, and we see it not. Riches generate a haughtiness that extends even to man's relations to God. Riches increase the love of this life, and the Lord says if a man love this life, he shall lose it. Riches exalt a man, inflate his heart, and fill him with a notion of his own power and security. The evil of riches consists not so much in the commission of low vulgar sins which shock society, as in the cold, haughty barrenness of heart which repels God. The

Christian law demands humility of heart, and how will the rich man have humility, to whom riches open every door? who by the power of riches wins the admiration and obsequiousness of the people? who is received everywhere with great consideration and respect? who is heard with deference, and obeyed with promptitude? who knows not what it is to be opposed? There is no greater obstacle to the entrance of God into the soul of man than that cold, proud self-sufficiency that comes of wealth. Christ demands that the great business of life should be religion. The rich man spreads himself out in many pursuits, and occupations. There is politics, there are the enjoyments of social life, there is power, and the fascination of business; and among all these, there may be a little bit of religion. Everything in the rich man's life tends to make the present visible order of things more real and delectable, and the unseen God and his world unreal. Hence does Paul admonish Timothy: "But they that will be rich fall into temptation and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition. For the love of money is the root of all evil; which while some coveted after, they have erred from the faith and pierced themselves through with many sorrows."—I. Tim. VI. 9—10. And Solomon saith: "He that trusteth in his riches shall fall."—Prov. I. 22.

To serve God, a man must break with the world. Now every object that man sets his heart on short of God retards his progress towards God. Riches multiply these objects. Who can have riches and not love them? and we cannot love God and Mammon. Riches give to a man a false conception of his life, and of his relations to God. The true state of fallen man is that he is wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked. But the rich man feels within himself: I am rich, and increased with goods, and am in need of nothing. Wealth encircles a man, and hems him in by many agencies that shut out Heaven, that make him proud, and that minister to his worst inclinations. Therefore does God say to man by the mouth of Jeremiah: "I spoke to thee in the day of thy prosperity, and thou saidst: I will not hear."—Jer. XXII 21.

Just as soon as a man begins to go after riches as the great business of life, God begins to die out of his soul. It can not

be otherwise. Christ has said that we can not serve God and Mammon, the god of riches. Where a man's treasure is, there is his heart. Riches are the treasure of a man upon earth, and man takes his heart from God and gives it to them.

With the accumulation of riches comes an ever increasing love of money-getting and business. A man finds that he can think of nothing else. Everything else seems flat and unreal, save gain. To protect his possessions, he will adopt the world's code of business. He will employ the world's many conventional deceits and prevarications in the details of his business. The world says that success in life is to make money; Christ says that success in life is to renounce all things and follow him. The rich man chooses the advice of the world. Man is inclined by nature to live by sense; and riches intensify it. Man is called by God to live by faith; and riches prevent it. Riches make a man love excessively this visible state of things. Hence doth the Scriptures say: "O Death, how bitter is the remembrance of thee to a man who hath peace in his possessions! To a man that is at rest, and whose ways are prosperous in all things, and who is yet able to take meat!" —Eccli. XLI. 1, 2.

The power that riches give a man makes him intolerant of the doctrines of Christianity. His opinions are flattered by the world; he feels self-confident; he will treat with God on a business basis. "He falls into the heresy of attempting salvation on larger lines than Christ authorized." He mistakes his accoutrements for a part of his being; he is full of the pride of life. He sees that the world worships what he possesses; and as this is the only world of which he knows aught, he rejoices in riches as an end; and here is one of the great errors of life. The rich man may retain some affiliation to the Church or to some sect. He is treated with consideration in the Church. Imperceptibly he is filled with the belief that God will deal with him on the same basis. Riches exaggerate the importance of the world and self. They give a man a footing to stand on, and draw him away from dependence on God. They fill him with pride, and make him less receptive of divine truth, less responsive to Christian practice. We find the

rich at theatres, balls, banquets, and in the marts of business; we find few of them at the confessional, or kneeling to receive the ashes of penance on their brows.

Riches give a man his own way in the world, and he extends it to the things of God. Human nature shrinks from humiliation; and riches intensify this repugnance. Riches move a man to self-complacency and self-approbation. The rich man relies upon himself, and rests contented with himself. The world is a great respecter of persons, and its worship of the rich man obscures in him the true conception of human life. He struts forth upon the stage of life as a chief actor, the world applauds, his heart is puffed up, and he forgets God.

There is a special significance in these words of the Lord: "Ye have received your consolation." It is like in sense to those words which the Lord puts in the mouth of Abraham: "Son remember that thou didst receive good things in thy lifetime, and likewise Lazarus evil things; but now he is comforted, and thou art tormented." It is the mysterious dispensation of God to permit full often those who serve the world to receive a large portion of its goods. It may be that there are certain good qualities and deeds in the lives of such men, which not being of a nature to merit supernatural good, are compensated by temporal prosperity. We see in all countries that the wealth and power of the earth are more in the possession of non-Catholics.

Catholic and non-Catholic emigrant came to this land on equal footing. The Catholic was as well endowed with ability to labor as his non-Catholic neighbor, and he labored more. But yet the land and the fulness thereof is in the hands of non-Catholics. One sees a ruling of Providence here, permitting the world's worshippers to receive their reward here.

The being full and laughing spoken of in the thirty-fifth verse of Luke do not constitute specific states of life. They are mere resultants of the general state of being rich, and they more graphically describe the tenor of the life of the rich. They are full with the goods of the world, secure behind worldly power, and the soul and its higher life is forgotten.

The satisfying of every bodily want works a great enervation of the spiritual side of our nature. The fearful hardships, cold, and death in the Alps kept not back Hannibal's

soldiers from the rich plains of Italy. But the comforts of Capua vanquished them. So it is with the Christian. The pampering of the body distorts the man's nature, and draws him closer to the plane of the beast; whereas it should be the aim of his life to get the beast out of him. Paul chastised his body, and brought it into subjection, lest he should become a reprobate, and those that are full, indulge the body, which therefore holds the mastery. This fulness signifies the ascendancy of matter over spirit. The world grows into the heart of the full man, and eats it away. We see all about us perfectly materialized lives, well fed, and well clothed, independent of everybody, and oblivious of God.

Those who laugh are those, who having the substance of this world, take into their hearts the frivolous thought and the vain pleasures of the day. The problem of human life demands soberness, thoughtfulness, sorrow and suffering. But these men have no thought of the deeper part of man's life. They surround themselves by a false world. The entire thought of this false world is vain and deceitful. New pleasures are continually sought for the cloyed senses. The better elements in man's nature become dwarfed and stupefied. An intense selfishness comes over the man. The mighty attraction of the sensible world has weakened his interest in a spiritual Heaven. A thought of death, or eternity, or God can not struggle through the thick wall of vain pleasures and pursuits. There is no time for reflection; the man's mind is always occupied by worthless issues. It is impossible that God should have his rightful place in such a soul. This is the curse of this age. Men are full, and laughing, and indulging in vain theories, and setting up worldly creeds in religion. The material life of man has advanced immensely during the last half century, but his spiritual life has gone backwards. Our people do not know their religion, and do not care to know it. Imperceptibly they assimilate much of the false thought round about them, and become weak in faith. The natural world is always with us; we only come into relations with the supernatural world by positive effort.

Most men live amid the superficialities and shows of the world, never thinking of the divine idea in man's life. And in

it all there is a nameless unrest; the soul sent into this world to struggle for the One Good will not be at rest while its powers are being wasted in filling the belly with meat.

If man's life were to end here, there is no period of the world's history in which it were pleasanter to live than in the present. And the evil lies in the fact that men in general live just as if this life were "the be-all and end-all here." They grow attached to this life, they praise its progress, they have no other life but this; their religion is a mere dead name; all the vitality of their being is expended on things whose duration is measured by time. Now as no medicine will effect a cure, unless the cause of the malady be removed, so there is no hope of making a man religious until the cause of his irreligiousness is taken away. It is vain to work on the surface of a man's life, and endeavor to make a man religious by agencies that only affect what might be called the outside of a man's life. A man must probe into the inmost soul, and dislodge the idol of this world. It is fearful to contemplate the number of nominally religious men, whose service of this world is an intense living reality; and whose service of Christ is a farce. Such men are incapable of making any real sacrifices for Christ. If the world offers any considerable prize for deserting Christ, they straightway desert him. They think the world's thoughts, and live the world's life; and fall into a certain spiritual lethargy, in which there is no vivid apprehension or any wish for anything that is above the range of the senses.

Our young men start in life with the idea that the chief aim in life is success in this material world. Man's relations to God are either set aside altogether or crowded into a corner. We measure everything by the standard of the material world. Christ has placed in contrast here the two sides of our life, and pronounced the sentence of both. The whole plan of the Lord's argument here is laid in antitheses. There is a contrast between the mode of life of the elect here and their life hereafter; and the thought is strengthened by the specific contrast. Such specific contrast is now established between the present pleasure of the reprobate and his future misery. It is not the sense that only the rich reprobate will suffer the miseries here specified; but that feature of reprobation is taken

which specifically contrasts with their present lot, to heighten the effect of the terrible words. It is a teaching of Catholic theology that, in the pain of sense in hell, man will suffer especially in those things in which he sinned while on earth; and this truth, in a general form, is also included in the sense of the present passage.

Christ also pronounces a woe, against those of whom men speak well. We must explain this passage according to the analogy of the whole argumentation. The mere fact that men speak well of a man is not an evidence of evil life. In fact, Christ bids his followers so live that men will be forced to speak well of them. And truly the man of sterling virtue will have the favorable testimony of his community, even in this degenerate age. The fair speaking of men, which Christ here reprobates, is the approbation bestowed on men by the spirit of the world. It denotes the opposite of the persecution promised to the elect of God. It is that popularity that is obtained by the sacrifice of some of the principles of true religion. It is that *aura popularis* that will come to a man who winks at the vices and errors of the time. If a man should arise and tell the American people that their laws contravened the laws of God, and that the better life of man was stifled by the nature of our life, he would be laughed to scorn, and men would rejoice that he had no power to enforce his opinions. But let some fellow arise and apotheosize our Godless materialism, and press and people applaud. Recently in England the representative of our nation proclaimed his idea of a noble nature to be one "who was sufficiently conscious of fallibility to be tolerant of all opinions; who has a faith too wide for doctrine, and a benevolence untrammelled by creed." The words are blasphemous, but the people of two continents honor the man for the utterance. The clamor of the world will be in favor of its own heroes, and against those who oppose its principles. When the prophets of old announced to the impious kings of Israel and Judah the wrath of God and the impending chastisement, they received prisons and death; the false prophets flattered their vanity, and received honors. John the Baptist would have escaped the sword of Herod, had he winked at Herod's incestuous union. The spirit of the world

has always spoken evil of the Church; it applauds the false sects. The English language is deeply infected with hatred of the Church and her principles. In large part the press of the world is anti-Catholic. The law-making power in the world is largely anti-Catholic. "The priests of the Church are driven into exile, as being inimical to the state. Her allegiance to authority is decried as unpatriotic. Now when the spirit of the world, which so persecutes the Church, speaks well of a man, it is an evident sign that the distinction between the tenor of his thoughts and deeds and those of the world is not sharply drawn. The Church has had to deplore in every age the defection of her weak children, who have sacrificed Catholic principles for the favor of the spirit of the world."

Whether in high or low place, the man who stands squarely on the Catholic platform will encounter the opposition of the spirit of the world. The man who will keep his Catholicity in the background, and temper it to meet the exigencies of the times, will not meet this opposition, and will fall under the head here spoken of by Christ. The truth of this passage is not an isolated member, but forms a feature of the general argument.

MATT. V. 13—16.

13. Ye are the salt of the earth: but if the salt have lost its savor, wherewith shall it be salted? it is thenceforth good for nothing, but to be cast out and trodden under foot of men.

13. Ὑμεῖς ἐστέ τὸ ἅλας τῆς γῆς: ἐὰν δὲ τὸ ἅλας μωρανθῇ, ἐν τίνι ἀλισθήσεται; εἰς οὐδὲν ἰσχύει ἔτι, εἰ μὴ βληθὲν ἔξω καταπατεῖσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

14. Ye are the light of the world. A city set on a hill cannot be hid.

14. Ὑμεῖς ἐστέ τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου: οὐ δύναται πόλις κρυβῆναι ἐπάνω ὄρους κειμένη.

15. Neither do men light a lamp, and put it under the bushel, but on the stand; and it shineth unto all that are in the house.

15. Οὐδὲ καίουσιν λύχνον κατιθέασιν αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν, καὶ λάμπει πᾶσιν τοῖς ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ.

16. Even so let your light shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father who is in Heaven.

16. Οὕτως λαμψάτω τὸ φῶς ὑμῶν ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὅπως ἴδωσιν ὑμῶν τὰ καλὰ ἔργα καὶ δοξάσωσιν τὸν Πατέρα ὑμῶν τὸν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

It is plain that the address here is to the Apostles and disciples in their capacity as teachers of mankind. The whole discourse was first for them, and for the world through them. In the foregoing passage, where the Lord directly addresses the rich, he had not in mind any of his disciples. It was an oratorical form of speech, in which a principle is attacked by an apostrophe to its exponents. But in the present passage, the discourse is a personal address, and is only verified in Christ's teachers. No greater thing can be said of a man than that he is the salt of the earth. Salt has two principal effects. It gives savor to food, and it preserves organic matter from corruption. Now in the moral order the legates of Christ accomplish these two effects in the nations of the earth. The world was without the knowledge of God, and without faith. It was like unsalted food, having no savor for its Creator. The legates of Christ gave it knowledge of God, and salted it by faith. They did this in the beginning by diffusing throughout the land the Message of Christ. They gradually formed themselves into a great system, a great organism, and this has kept alive the faith of Christ ever since. To them every man must come for salt, that God may be pleased with the savor of his soul. Here again we see the design of Christ to teach the world by commissioned men, having authority to teach in his name.

Salt preserves from corruption; and the teachers of the New Law were to save men from the moral corruption of sin by preaching the word, by instructing the young, by administering the sacraments; in a word, by employing every remedy left on earth by Christ for the destruction of sin. He gave into their hands his doctrine, his sacraments, his commission. In declaring them to be the salt of the earth, the universality of Christ's kingdom is proclaimed. They were to operate among all the nations of the earth, and salt them with Christ's doctrine and moral code.

It is a true adage: "*Corruptio optimi pessima*"; hence the Lord places in contrast to their high function in the world, the terrible effect of their defection. Salt is a first principle in its line of action. Its properties of salting and preserving come from the nature that God has given it, and these properties can not be given by any second cause. It is vain to object against the argument of Christ that the conditional sentence involves a contradiction: salt can not lose its savor. An argument may conclude, even though the conditional premise be an impossibility. For instance, we can say: "If God ceased to exist, all creation would cease to exist." The conclusion is just, and illustrates how essentially creatures depend on God. Therefore this impossible conditional here has a just conclusion. The corruption of salt would be irremediable. And as it has no other uses in human life, it would be cast out as an inert, worthless element. The natural fact is not based on technical knowledge. The Saviour chose one of the simplest facts in ordinary life to serve as an illustration of a high truth in the moral order. There is no waste of nerve power to seize the sensible illustration. The Saviour wished not that the mind should rest there, but that it should immediately seize the metaphorical sense, which relates to man's life.

The apostolic body is also a first principle in its order of causality. If it should fail, there is no power on earth by which it could be restored. The souls of men are as dependent on it as meat is upon salt. There is nothing higher than it, except God himself. God could have devised other agencies to administer religion to men, but he has not done so. The power of the Spirit operates in the souls of men, but its ordinary method is to work through the medium of that apostolic body. Their work is to give that which by nature men have not, and to preserve them from corruption to which by nature they are prone. Men were not expected to receive their religion by private inspiration, or from the written word. They were to be salted by the salt of the earth. And the salt of the earth was not to be salted by any other agency. The Lord Jesus was to go back to his Father, and leave them supreme upon earth; and leave all men dependent on them. If they failed, the present plan of redemption would fail. Men can err, and come

back to the source, and be re-salted; but if the source fail, there is no further remedy on earth. The truth is expressed in a metaphor, and we must not look for a metaphysical exactness in its application. The plain sense is that the Apostles and their successors are the first principle in the human agency that God employs to work the salvation of men; and the nature of their calling renders a failure on their part of terrible consequence. As a body they could not fail. God placed an element of infallibility in their head, and in the entire body united to the head; but as mere individuals they could fail, and some have failed. To illustrate this point, let us in spirit set out with Paul on his first journey. He was the salt of the earth, going to give savor to the Gentiles. Let us suppose that at that juncture he failed, and denied Christ. The great Churches of Corinth, of Thessalonica, of Philippi, of Galatia, of Ephesus, and of Colossus would never have been. The fate of multitudes rested on the fidelity of Paul; the fate of many rests upon every proper successor of the Apostles. God could send an angel to do the work that man fails in, but he does not so. It is true that the faithlessness of one of the band is in part made good by the fidelity of another legate of the Lord; but this does not change the nature of the defection in itself considered. Moreover there are evil effects which follow the failure of a legate of Christ which can never be taken away.

The world has passed through some changes since that time. The teaching power of the Church then only consisted of those few individuals. The dependence of the world upon one of those few was greater than it is to-day upon any individual. Hence the evil effects would have been greater had any one of them been false to his calling in his apostolic career. The Church has now grown to such proportions, and her elements are so ordered, that, if the individual legate errs, his failure is in part made good by the great life of the Church, but the nature of his act is the same. The divine vitality of the adult Church, in a measure, neutralizes the effects of the wound inflicted; but the individual becomes salt without savor, and those souls, who stand in the especial need of salt, corrupt and die. Every member of the priesthood of Christ is a portion of the salt of the earth. From the moment that the care of

souls is committed to him, he stands to them in the relation of salt to food. One of his people may fall away, and the general body suffers no special evil results. But if he fail, the whole body suffers. The evil that results can only be properly judged by God who sees the proper condition of the soul's life. The strong are weakened, the weak fall away, and a great enervation invades the general body. Now it is not the intention of the Lord to cut off the possibility of penance to the unfaithful legate. Christ speaks only of the effects produced by the legate while actually unfaithful to his calling, and no figure could express it better than the salt without its savor.

The terrible condition of the fallen legate is well expressed by the unprofitableness of salt without its savor. It has no proper uses. The corruption in the vegetable and animal kingdoms does not render absolutely worthless the thing affected. Its corruption is a change, by which its elements dissolve to unite in other compounds. Organic compounds rot, and form manure, which supports new forms of life. But the moral corruption of the legate of God renders him, as such, an absolutely worthless creature of God, and no good results follow to redeem, in any measure, his fall.

This is yet more forcibly expressed in another discourse of the Lord, recorded by St. Luke in the thirty-fourth and thirty-fifth verses of the XIV. Chapter of his Gospel: "Salt is good: but if the salt have lost its savor, wherewith shall it be salted? It is not fit for the land, nor yet for the dunghill, but men cast it out."

The contrast between the state of fidelity and the fallen state of the legate of Christ is terrible. In his faithful state, we see him a heavenly leader among men. While men are given to necessary worldly issues, he is interceding to God for them. He is filling his soul with divine truths, "till it thrills in every nerve of him, and pulses in every drop of his blood," and then he comes among them, and imparts to them the truth which has passed through his own heart, and lives in him. He is an angel of life

But on the other hand the fallen legate lies in his dishonor. He may preserve his outward respectability, according to the world's pattern, but before God, his life is foul and unprofitable.

There is not a sadder sight in all the universe than the salt of the earth which has lost its savor. The high powers given him remain inert. He may still cling to his place, and exclude the profitable agent. A common man can fall, and go down to hell, and draw no one with him. Not so the priest of God. He is appointed to administer to human souls that without which they shall perish, and his failure, whether through inertia or positive deed, affects many lives. Therefore there is nothing grander or better on earth than the faithful legate; nothing baser or more unprofitable than the unfaithful one.

So necessary was it that the teachers of mankind should value the high functions that they were to perform in the world, that the Lord enforces the lesson of this first figure by a second of equal force, which especially relates to their office as teachers. They are the light of the world. God illumines the material earth by the luminaries of heaven. Earth is dependent on them for its light. If they withhold it, the earth is dark. God could have given light to earth in other ways, but he has established this way. In like manner, God illumines the moral world by teachers. They are the luminaries of the spiritual world of men. Christ is the essential light of the world; his legates are the avenues by which light comes to man. If the legates withhold their light, the world becomes dark.

One of the worst evils of the world of that day was the moral darkness of paganism. These lights of the world were to dispel that darkness, and they did it. The darkness of materialism now hangs like a pall over the civilized world, and this is harder to be dispelled. The teachers of mankind are less *intense* now, and hearts are less receptive of truth. What the world needs is more light; not the false light that makes objects appear in false proportions, but the pure light of Heaven, that shows man his duty and his destiny. The world was recovered from the darkness, of paganism by those few luminaries. The luminaries have now been greatly multiplied. If they all shone with the intensity of the first Apostles, even this Stygian darkness must give place to light. Again, we must call attention to the fact that the divine idea of religion is not that every man should illumine himself by independent dealing with

God himself, but that some men should teach, and others should be taught. This idea prevails only in the Catholic Church. At every step, one finds a contradiction between protestantism and the Scriptures. The time is coming when the issue will not be between protestantism and Catholicity, but between no-religion and Catholicity.

The relevance of the city on the hill to the present theme is not immediately evident. Without doubt, the city on the hill is the Church of Christ. This is clearly evidenced by the words of Isaiah, II. 2, and Micah, IV. 1: "And it shall come to pass in the last days that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it." The location of the city on the hill is an easy figure to convey the truth that the Church of Christ was destined to be visible and conspicuous in the world. The Church consists of various elements. There are elements of organization as a human society, and these are visible. There is its form of government and there are its representatives of authority. There are its rites, its sacrifice, and the outward signs of its sacraments; all these are visible. Then there are the spiritual effects which are operated by God in the souls of the Church's members through the Church, and these are not visible. Some of the truths of Christ have reference to these invisible effects, and some relate to the external organization of the Church. The present text refers to the visibility of the Church, and to such visibility that all must see it. It has impressed its character on every page of history; and the best achievements of man have been moulded by its thought. Now Christ intended that it should thus come forth before the eyes of men, and lay its truths before every man, that he might accept them, and be saved. From all quarters of the earth, man may lift up his eyes and see the city upon the hill. It is a beautiful figure, more expressive to an Oriental mind. The usual site for villages in that land was some elevation. And the weary traveller can look a great way through the clear atmosphere and see in the distance the cluster of human habitations on the hill top.

Christ's Apostles were the chief factors in that first city on the hill. As the city grew, their successors were multiplied,

but the design of Christ does not change regarding them. From the fact that they were to be the active guiding element in the city upon the hill, Christ destined that they should not live for themselves. Their lives belonged to humanity. Men were to look to them for words of doctrine and deeds of example. The eyes of all were to be directed to them, and their words were to be like to those of the Son of God. They were to stand high above the sordid issues of earth, spiritualized men, set up to enter far into the mysteries of the spiritual world, and reveal its truths to men. There is a native tendency in cultivated men to love mystery, to desire to go into some realm of thought where only a few enter. There they create associations with those grander souls who wander through strange seas of thought. In the legate of Christ, this tendency should be totally aimed at the spiritual world. He should merge his whole life into its realities. He should study its manifestations, and the agencies that hinder its presence in the souls of men. He will study psychology, to see wherein the human soul shuts itself out from its proper life.

The Lord enforces this figure by another. No man lights a candle, and hides its light under a bushel. In Luke, VIII. 16, he expresses the same thought in slightly different form: "No man when he hath lighted a candle, covereth it with a vessel, or putteth it under a bed; but setteth it upon a candlestick that they who enter in may see the light." The whole sense of the argument is to impress upon Christ's representatives that they are called to labor for others. Christ made them luminaries and the object of a luminary is to give light to others. A common man might say: "Let the great world go its ways, I shall hold aloof, and save my own soul." But the Apostle can not say thus. He is to save his own soul by the salvation of others. Not that his individual sanctification is to be neglected in the official care of others. He is to believe the truths, and do the truths, and thereby make others believe them and do them. As the agencies of teaching have multiplied, the obligation touches not in equal degree every legate of Christ; but there must always be some proper Apostles, and these must follow the plan of apostolic life as laid down by Christ. In fact, the great plan of the eternal priesthood of Christ regards

the sanctification of the people through its agency; and that priest's life is poorly lived, which does not directly or indirectly promote that end. The great defect in many a legate of Christ is failure to appreciate what his mission is. He is the light of the earth. All over the earth there is darkness, and he is the light to dispel it. The enterprise is difficult. Human hearts are cold, and hard, and unfaithful. His environments invite him to that which is pleasant and comfortable. If he shrinks from the work, he is hiding his light under a bushel, and must account to his master for its misuse. God expects more of his legate than a mere non-commission of crime; he expects an activity that will impress the souls of men. If all the lights which God has placed in the world were shining with the luminosity of St. Paul, much of the present darkness must needs give place to light. And how shall man send this light into the souls of others? Not by merely saying in a cold, formal way: "There is salvation, and there are the conditions: take it or leave it: if you wish to go to hell, it is no business of mine." Not so; but by pleading, by praying, by exhorting, by helping, and by encouraging, shall the light of the world light up the dull dark souls of men.

Christ fled from human recognition of his good works. It is a great principle of his teaching that man shall not do his good works before men. And here he instructs the guides of men to let their light so shine before men, that men may see their good works. There is no conflict here, but varied manifestations of the same great truth. In the first place, the express teaching of Christ and the analogy of faith make it absolutely certain that the desire for human recognition for ourselves in any work whatsoever is a defect. Therefore we must make the présent text of Scripture conform to this evident principle position of doctrine. Christ in this text impresses upon them the important truth that the nature of their calling places them before men. Men are commanded to look to them for truth and guidance both by word and example. They are to hide their personality, but not their good works. They are called to realize that the whole course of their actions should influence favorably the lives of others. The motive of it all is expressed by Christ, not that men should glorify them, but that

they should glorify God. This is the right order of life. A legate of Christ should feel that his life, with its intense activities and power of good, should be before the people. He is not a man to shut himself up in a selfish way, and never look out of doors at the great tide of life that rolls onward towards two eternities. His part of life is to come into close sympathy with the struggling mass of humanity; to know their lives from personal contact. If a man were to appear upon any public stage, and read Hamlet, Macbeth, King Lear, or any great drama in a cold perfunctory way, the effect on the hearers would be nothing. But when the actor becomes oblivious of his own personality, and for a time lives the very life of his heroes; when he projects himself into their very existences, and not merely speaks their words, but acts their lives, and feels their mighty passions, then he carries us with him, and dry dead forms become living breathing realities. So it is with the light of the world. He absolves not his conscience by the mere official recital of the message of redemption. He must act it. He must speak the thoughts which he feels. The legate of Christ is called to live again the life of Christ. When man sins or suffers, he can not say: "What is that to me?" Nothing affecting the proper life of man can be indifferent to him. His time, his thoughts, his energies, belong to the great cause of Christ. And let no man be disconcerted by the non-appearance of present results. Good deeds are eternal seeds, sown in the great field of time, and their fruit is secure, even though it take centuries of years to mature. Every noble thought, every spoken truth, and good work makes the universe better.

The truths of Christ are absolute, and in themselves considered, apply to every period and condition of human life. But the conditions of man's life and the psychological status of the world have greatly changed since the deliverance of Christ's message. Hence the application of the eternal truth will vary somewhat, in accordance with these changed conditions. In that age, the Gentile world was in darkness, but men were not filled with the presumption of material progress. The hearts of men were open to the truth; and they gave ear to the message of salvation. But now no man can draw men as they

were drawn then. The Gospel is an old story, and the men of to-day wish for new things. A cold indifference has settled upon the people, and their independence demands to be let alone. We can not invade the ordinary walks of life with our message as did the Apostles. We should bring derision upon our cause, and be turned away as meddlers. We must work by new methods, but always with the eternal consciousness that we are still the light of the world. Darkness has entrenched itself behind new defenses, and we must find new means to take the positions. The general diffusion of superficial knowledge has made men presumptuous and wise in their own conceits. The legate of Christ can not pare down the old truths to make them acceptable to the prurient tastes of these days; but in presenting these truths to men, he must employ fitting counter methods to cope with the world's methods. The world is active, the exponents of error are active, and the legate of Christ can not move along in an easy, comfortable way, and hope either to hold the present following, or increase its strength. There is demanded in the legate of Christ intense manhood, intense soul-life. The world gives much now to refinement and culture; the legate of Christ can only transfer this worldly idolatry to a supernatural object by meeting it on its own plane, with all that is best of refinement and culture in his soul. Strong faith may endure the shock of seeing a rude, coarse man standing forth as the teacher of mankind; but the weaker member will stagger, and the unbeliever will harden his heart, and justify his unbelief by the repulsiveness of the exponent of Christianity. Not that we would substitute refinement for faith, but the legate of Christ should be the most polite and refined of men, and make of this an agency to gain the confidence and respect of souls for the purpose of bringing Christ into them. He has only one aim in life, and that is to make the world believe Christ's words, and keep his commandments, and if he goes through life with that single aim coupled with intense action, he will light up many lives, and men will see it, and glorify God by believing and by doing. In putting his message before men, let him make use of the modes of dealing with the people that our manners and customs justify, with the perpetual realization that he is a light

set up for the people to see and follow. And his aim should be that the people should see his light but not himself. There is a class of works which God wishes to be performed before the people, and there is a class of works to be performed in secret. The legate of Christ is a public man, and men will see his deeds, and be either helped by their example, or injured by their weakness. The man is not to parade his virtues, but, with the humility of truth, reproduce the life of Christ before the gaze of men. And his motive should be that men should be brought nearer to God by the power of teaching and the power of example. And he will hide away self as much as possible, and rejoice that his deeds are producing fruit, while he is forgotten. The man goes before the people in doctrine and in deed; but the intention of the mind is fixed on the glory of God that may ensue, and not on self. And from the good deeds done in secret a light shall also go forth in the Lord's own time, and in the Lord's way, and men will be guided to life by the enhanced beauty of the hidden deed.

MATT. V. 17—20.

17. Think not that I came to destroy the Law or the Prophets: I came not to destroy, but to fulfill.

18. For verily I say unto you: Till Heaven and earth pass away, one yod or one tittle shall in no wise pass away from the law, till all things be accomplished.

19. Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, shall be called least in the kingdom of Heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, he shall be called great in the kingdom of Heaven.

17. Μὴ νομίσητε ὅτι ἦλθον καταλῦσαι τὸν νόμον ἢ τοὺς προφῆτας: οὐκ ἦλθον καταλῦσαι ἀλλὰ πληρῶσαι.

18. Ἀμὴν γὰρ λέγω ὑμῖν, ἕως ἂν παρέλθῃ ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ, ἰῶτα ἓν ἢ μία κεραία οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου, ἕως ἂν πάντα γένηται.

19. Ὃς ἐάν οὖν λύσῃ μίαν τῶν ἐντολῶν τούτων τῶν ἐλαχίστων καὶ διδάξῃ οὕτως τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, ἐλάχιστος κληθήσεται ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν: δς δ' ἂν ποιήσῃ καὶ διδάξῃ, οὗτος μέγας κληθήσεται ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν.

20. For I say unto you, that except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of Heaven.

20. Λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, ὅτι ἐὰν μὴ περισσεύσῃ ὑμῶν ἡ δικαιοσύνη πλεῖον τῶν γραμματέων καὶ Φαρισαίων οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθῃτε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν.

The phrase, "Think not" denotes that the Lord aimed the present words against some existing persuasion that had come into the minds of the people. The evolution of the new order out of the old was an important issue for the men of that day. It was a work of God, too grand to be readily comprehended by the little minds of men. It is ever thus. The compass of the human mind is limited, and the truths of God are infinite, hence the difficulty to properly receive these truths into our souls. If men were willing to keep the truths in their hearts, and wait for the full manifestation in the vision of God, all would be well. The basis of faith is sufficiently clear, and man's duty is plain. But proud man is presumptuous, and ever vainly striving to bring God down to man's level of comprehension. Hence the oracle of divine truth labors under disadvantages. The religious element in man is never on the surface, and the greater part of human life is lived on the surface. The voice of God is never to the outer man, but only to the inner man. Man is too much concerned with his outer man. The world speaks to the outer man, the senses move the outer man. The world sees the outer man. All things tend to make a man oblivious of the inner man. Men ever endeavor to satisfy the obligation of religion by an outer religion. But the attempt is vain. God speaks only to the inner man, and the soul's life is inward. Christ found the same condition of things. He appealed to the deeper element in man; his enemies appealed to that which was on the surface. He could be understood only by the thoughtful, reflecting mind; they were understood by the mob. Now the opponents of Christ made use of this condition of things to block his work. They represented to the popular mind that Christ was against Moses; that he contemplated the overthrow of the Mosaic code. To set right the minds of men on this point, Christ gave utterance to these present words. The Mosaic code was the embryo of the perfect

law of Christ. There was in it certain eternal principles of supernatural faith and morality, and these Christ retained. The prophets brought these principles into prominence, and kept alive Israel's great hope of the Messiah. But as in the embryo, when it passes into a more perfect state of life, certain elements are cast off, so it was with Israel's Law. Its complex ritual observances were necessary for the period of its lower state of development; they were a mere time-vesture, not the substance. As it passed into its perfect state through Christ, it laid aside these. It lost its earthliness, and became elevated into a spiritual law. Now this twofold character of the Old Law gives rise to expressions of Scripture which seem contradictory. When we hear St. Paul discoursing of the weakness of the Law; of its uselessness and abrogation, we must understand this of that larval outer-growth, assumed for the peculiar conditions of its first stages of life. And when Christ assures us of the endurance of the Law, we understand the embodiment of its substance in the law of the spirit. In many ways, Christ perfected this element of the Law. The Old Law taught man the existence and unity of God; Christ expanded this into the doctrine of the Trinity, and gave man a fuller knowledge of the attributes of God and the sonship of all men through Christ. The doctrine of the future state of man was dim in the Old Code; Christ made it clear to us. The fulness of the doctrine of God's love for man, of merit, of grace and redemption, only came with Christ. Moreover, the Law laid down precepts of man's duty, but it left man unaided to perform it; Christ gives power to do that which he commands. The Old Law taught the necessity and the mode of sacrificial worship of God; Christ perfected the weakness of the burnt offering into the infinite oblation of himself.

The force of verse eighteen is to corroborate the preceding statement, and it is strengthened by the *ἀμήν* with which it opens. By the "heaven" and "earth" of this verse, the Lord means the whole visible universe. By the "passing" of these, the Lord means not their annihilation. The Lord created things that they might continue to exist; and he will annihilate none of his creatures. He is the plenitude of being; and it is in accordance with his will to fill the awful void with beings.

The end of nature, which men speak of, is not her end, but her change. Of this great change, Paul speaks to the Romans, VIII. 19-21: "For the earnest expectation of the creation waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God. For the creation was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope; because the creation itself shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption, into the glorious liberty of the children of God." And Peter saith: "Nevertheless we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness."—II. Pet. III. 13. Of the nature of this change we know very little. It certainly does not contemplate the reconstruction of the numberless creatures in the vegetable and animal kingdoms, which have been formed out of matter, and have reverted into matter; but it means that the great substratum of nature, of which such creatures were but different manifestations will endure, and in a changed state will serve man in his incorruptible state.

It is the intention of the Lord to affirm the endurance of the Law as long as time should be. Clearly and forcibly he states his position on the subject which divided Jewish opinions. The types of the Old Law should not be annulled, but should be raised to a higher order of truth in their fulfilment. The promises of God to man were maintained in Christ; the moral element of the Old Code was perfected and explained; the Messianic prophecies were fulfilled; thus all things were fulfilled.

In the time of Christ, the Hebrew language was written in that form of writing which came in with the Babylonian Captivity. With some slight modifications, it is the mode of writing adopted to-day. In that script, the letter yod is the smallest of the letters. It is not unlikely that in the language of the people, any small part of the Law was figuratively spoken of as a yod. Hence, in the present statement of the Lord, yod stands for the minutest particle of the written deposit. It is interesting to note the discussions that have existed among the Gemarists concerning this letter yod. These traditions show the spirit of adoration of the smallest element of the text which prevailed among the Jews, and which Christ endeavored to guide aright in the present passage.

There is some uncertainty regarding the element of the text which Christ designates as the *κεραία*, which the Vulgate renders "apex," and the English "tittle." The proper sense of *κεραία* is a little horn. It seems that the Lord designates by this term that little point which projects from some of the Hebrew letters found on coins of the second and first century B. C.

This is a smaller part of the text than even the yod and the uniting of it to the yod gives to the statement the force of a short climax. The Pharisees boasted that they stood for the maintenance of the Law. The Lord makes answer that he also stood to maintain the same, even to its least element. The language of the Lord is very forcible. It affirms the comprehension of every minute part, and gives to the whole an endurance co-existent with time itself. It is evident that the Lord is not speaking of such absolute endurance of the mere material text. Many yods and many *κεραία* have perished from the text. Whole words and sentences have been corrupted. No Scriptural text in the world in any language exists absolutely free from textual errors. It is not of the material element of the Law that Christ speaks. He took a concrete illustration from the material text to present clearly to human minds the eternal endurance of the soul of the Law. God gave a message by Moses and the prophets to man in the Old Law. It was partial and preparatory; a participation of divine truth, partly clearly expressed, as in the decalogue, partly couched in types and symbols. This communication of divine truth was the object of Christ's veneration. It was the substance of the Old Code, eternal and unchanging, like to God who gave it.

In Christ there was an intense reverence for everything divine. The Law was divine, and was for him the holiest thing in all the world. The Pharisees paid a formal reverence to the mere letter and outward body of the Law. Christ's reverence was for the substantial truths of the spirit of the Law, which he perfected and perpetuated.

The nineteenth verse continues the same line of argument. It is, however, one of the difficult verses of the Gospel. The general line of the Lord's argument is plain. To set forth the permanence and holiness of the Law Christ defines the power

and sanction of its least element. The deduction is plain and easy to any mind. If the least part is so sacred and inviolable, *a fortiori* the greater portions must be so. The Lord's words contemplate the attitude of teachers towards the Law. We need scarcely repeat that by the Law Christ means those eternal truths underlying the ritual observances and the types. He has delivered his own position regarding these; he reinforces it by setting forth what are the obligations of other teachers regarding the same. Here again the plan of the argument is *a fortiori*. Christ begins by establishing a severe penalty upon the one who shall violate a greater command. He joins teaching with doing, because his intention is to establish the sanctity of the Law by the obligations of the teacher. It is vain to restrict the Saviour's words to the truths of the old Law. He is speaking without restrictions of that part of the Old Law which endures in the New, and therefore his words apply to the truths of God in both dispensations.

Knabenbauer holds that the sense of the *λύση* is to abrogate, to render null and void; and he interprets the Saviour's words to contain an inhibition to change or annul any substantial part of the Law. Though this sense is certainly included, we believe that the sense of the words is still more comprehensive. The act of breaking therein spoken of is any violation, whether by abrogation or transgression; and the condemned teaching is that which would in any way effect that the least part of the eternal law of God to man should not be observed. The argument is in substance: "Ye accuse me of setting aside the law of God to man, but so far is this untrue that I say to you that any teacher among men who shall so do in the least part, becomes liable to the penalty which I here establish." Neither is it necessary to particularize what are those least commandments of the Lord. The Lord is arguing for the sanctity of the Law by way of illustration, and this does not necessitate that in his mind or in ours there should be a specific idea of the greater and least elements of the Law. Nothing is more vain than to endeavor to point out those elements of the Law which the Lord denominated the least commandments. When St. Paul says that "the foolishness of God is wiser than men, and the weakness of God is stronger

than men," it would be vain to inquire what constituted the foolishness and weakness of God. So in the present instance, the Lord simply argues *a fortiori* for the endurance and sanctity of the Law from that which is verified in the violation of its least part.

The final difficulty of the passage consists in establishing the exact estate of him who shall be called least in the kingdom of Heaven. The traditional and scientific data on this passage are very unsatisfactory. Some of the greatest of commentators have explained the passage to signify that by the designation of least, the Lord meant that such a one should have no part in the triumphant Church. Others again believe that by the kingdom of Heaven the Lord is here speaking of the Church on earth; and they assign to the one whom the Lord calls least, the lowest place in the militant Church. In all the teaching of the Lord, we find that the particular truth on which he wishes the mind to rest is brought out with clearness. In this passage the central truth is by no means uncertain. It is that the Law is holy, and the least violation of it entails a penalty. Now in expressing this clear truth, Christ made use of a figure of speech called by the grammarians *paronomasia*. He plays on the word *ἐλάχιστος*, in saying that the violator of the *least* commandment will be the least in the kingdom of Heaven. He does not fix the exact estate of the man; he purposely left a certain vagueness in that; for he is not passing strict judgment on the works of men, but only inculcating the sanctity of the Law. Hence there is not in the words the judgment of the degree of malice of the act, nor the specific punishment rendered therefor. It is an elegant rhetorical figure to express that God is angry with the man who in any way deprives of effect any element of God's Law to man. It is probable that by the kingdom of Heaven in this context, Christ means the earthly phase of the Church's life. To express the penalty for the violation of the least part of the enduring elements of the Law, he ranks the violator of the Law in the lowest place in the Church. The thought of the Lord goes no further than this. It is not a question of salvation or reprobation, but simply that any violation of God's law dishonors the soldier of Christ, and places him in the lowest rank.

The exposition of this member renders the sense of the following member of the sentence very easy. Conversely, in that same stage of the Church, he who keeps the whole Law, and teaches others so to do, shall be in honor. One of the most honorable occupations of man is that of teaching truth, especially the higher truths which hold the key to man's life. Christ exhorts us first to action; because no man can, in the proper sense of the word, be a teacher of divine truths, unless he has first taken them into his heart of heart, and made them motives of his life. A man may perfunctorily pronounce words; but to sway men, he must feel what he says, and live what he says. In this, and in this alone, consists the greatness of man; to shape all the acts of his life in accordance with the great truths of God, to know these truths, to love them, and wish to know them. By such thoughts and such acts, the man's nature becomes purer, and his life instead of being a farce, is the development of a divine idea. There is ever present to the true Christian a realization that there is a divine law for all his actions. He reverences it, and his morality is founded on supernaturalism. That sacred law regulates his secret thoughts, his words, and outward actions. A certain social morality may be built on naturalism, but it does not move the inner nature of man. It cannot apply to all human acts, nor will it sustain a man in great temptation. Whatever of real supernatural good there is in the world, is the product of the law of God. Now when the faithful observer of this holy law extends his influence even to the teaching of others to do what he is doing, he multiplies his virtues by diffusing them in others. There is no benefactor of mankind like to him who increases in man the right knowledge of his Creator and his Creator's law.

The twentieth verse is a sort of preamble to the extended comparison between the Pharisaic interpretation of the Law and Christ's interpretation, which is expounded in the following verses. Christ urges the case against his opponents by turning the tables upon them. They had accused him of setting aside the Law of Moses; he now arraigns them on the same charge, and shows that by mere outward observance of dry forms, they had obscured and neglected the deeper reality which was the substance of the Law. With strong emphasis, therefore, he

declares to his followers that they must be more observant of the Law than its first custodians, to obtain the effect for which the Law was ordained, The principle that “*finis legis non cadit sub precepto*” avails not of the law of God. He legislates for the spirit and consciences of men; and unless his law enters there, and becomes a motive of action, man’s service is nothing. This was what the disciples were invited to do.

MATT. V. 21—26.

21. Ye have heard that it was said to them of old time: Thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment:

22. But I say unto you: that every one who is angry with his brother shall be in danger of the judgment; and whosoever shall say to his brother: Raca, shall be in danger of the council; and whosoever shall say: Thou fool, shall be in danger of the hell of fire.

23. If therefore thou art offering thy gift at the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee,

24. Leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift.

25. Agree with thine adversary quickly, while thou art with him in the way; lest haply the adversary deliver thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and thou be cast into prison.

21. Ἦκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη τοῖς ἀρχαίοις οὐ φονεύσεις: ὃς δ' ἂν φονεύσῃ ἔνοχος ἔσται τῇ κρίσει.

22. Ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι πᾶς ὁ ὀργιζόμενος τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ ἔνοχος ἔσται τῇ κρίσει: ὃς δ' ἂν εἴπῃ τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ ρακά, ἔνοχος ἔσται τῷ συνεδρίῳ: ὃς δ' ἂν εἴπῃ μωρέ, ἔνοχος ἔσται εἰς τὴν γέενναν τοῦ πυρός.

23. Ἐὰν οὖν προσφέρῃς τὸ δῶρόν σου ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον καὶ κεῖ μνησθῇς ὅτι ὁ ἀδελφός σου ἔχει τι κατὰ σοῦ,

24. Ἄφες ἐκεῖ τὸ δῶρόν σου ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου καὶ ὑπάγε πρῶτον, διαλλάγηθι τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου, καὶ τότε ἔλθὼν πρόσφερε τὸ δῶρόν σου.

25. Ἴσθι εὐνοῶν τῷ ἀντιδίκῳ σου ταχύ, ἕως ὅτου εἰ μετ' αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ, μή ποτέ σε παραδῷ ὁ ἀντίδικος τῷκριτῇ καὶ ὁκριτὴς τῷ ὑπηρέτῃ καὶ εἰς φυλακὴν βληθῇς.

26. Verily I say unto thee: 26. Ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, οὐ μὴ
 Thou shalt by no means come ἐξέλθῃς ἐκεῖθεν, ἕως ἂν ἀποδῷς τὸν
 out thence, till thou have paid ἔσχατον κοδράντην.
 the last farthing.

In the twenty-second verse, there is an important variant in the codices and the versions. The greater number of codices and authorities add *εἰκῇ* after the *ὀργιζόμενος τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ*. This also is followed by the King James' Bible, which renders the passage: "Who is angry with his brother without cause," etc. Among the codices which bear this reading are the uncials E, K, L, M, S, U, V, Γ, Δ*, and Π. It is adopted by the Vetus Itala, by all the Syriac versions, the Coptic, Armenian and Gothic versions, by Eusebius, Cyril, Chrysostom, Cyprian, and Lucifer. It is found also in three codices of the Vulgate, viz., Bigotianus, Egertonensis, and Oxoniensis. Nevertheless, it seems from internal and external evidence that the *additamentum* is spurious. In the first place, it weakens the expression, as though there could be cases where anger against the brother is justifiable. It is justifiable to feel moved by righteous indignation against the wrong that a brother man does; this is not anger against the brother. What the Lord had in mind was the feeling of anger and revenge, which arises from personal motives against our fellow man, and this is never lawful. The Saviour's words, therefore, are of universal application. It would seem that lack of discernment to distinguish properly what is anger against a brother moved the insertion of the restrictive adverb.

The authorities against the reading are fewer but weighty. Jerome is against it, and declares that it was not found in many of the Old Greek codices. Augustine corroborates Jerome's statement. The term is rejected by Origen and Basil; and it is not found in any of the four great codices. The Ethiopian version and the best codices of the Vulgate also omit it.

In the twenty-first verse, some have believed that Christ contrasts his teaching with the Pharisaic interpretation of the Mosaic Law. But the intrinsic evidence moves us to hold that Christ here compares his complete law with the partial enactment of Moses. To the ancient men of Israel it was said on Mt.

Sinai: "Thou shalt not kill." Though said by God through Moses *to those ancients*, it was said for all men of all time. Nor was the command unknown to man before Sinai's legislation. From the beginning, the Almighty had forbidden the shedding of human blood. The blood of the slaughtered Abel cried to the Creator from the earth. To Noah, God said: "At the hand of every man's brother will I require the life of man. Whosoever sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed."—Gen. IV. 5-6. But on Sinai the Law was codified, enlarged, and solemnly promulgated. The penalty "—he shall be guilty of the judgment —" which Christ mentions, does not exist in express terms in the Mosaic code. Here again Schegg, Bisping, Weiss and others believe that this penalty was a statute of the doctors of the Law. But it seems to be a substantial element of the Law itself. In the Mosaic legislation provision was made for judges who should have jurisdiction in cases of infringement of the Mosaic code, which regulated all the departments of man's life: "Judges and officers shalt thou make thee in all thy gates, which the Lord God giveth thee, throughout thy tribes: and they shall judge the people with just judgment."—Deut. XVI. 18. These judges took cognizance of all crimes committed against the Law. The Law was simple and plain, the modes and customs of life were simple; the Law had not been weakened by an endless mass of technicalities, and was not impeded by the complexity of its own nature. Now as the crime was prohibited, and the tribunal established, it resulted directly from the Law itself that the judgment followed upon the infraction of the Law. It was a principle of the people's life. The mind of the people always associated the two things, the infraction of the Law and the condemnation by the judges. In fact, only the first member of the verse is comprised in that which was strictly said to those of old. The Lord's declaration would be in substance: "Ye have heard that God spoke to your forefathers saying: Thou shalt not kill. In your polity built upon that legislation, it hath been a principle, that he who slayeth his fellowman shall be guilty of the judgment of the judges."

Attention should be given to Ἠκούσατε, "ye have heard." It manifests that the ordinary mode of communicating the Law to the people was by the teachers. No other mode would be fit for that Law or for the New Law.

Now this enactment of the Law was good; the sanction was good. But it did not go far enough. It aimed to preserve the public order and peace of the people; but it did not sufficiently purify the heart. For the rude people, to whom it was applied, it was all that they could bear. The Law waited for Christ to perfect it. And he does so by endorsing the first substance, and enlarging it, and giving it spiritual life. The letter of the Old Law forbade the shedding of blood, and Christ extends its scope to forbid all anger against the brother. The Old Law dealt chiefly with external acts. Christ perfects it by declaring that the thought of the mind impelling the man to the external act is equal before God to the act itself. The form of expression employed by Christ shows the sovereign authority with which he spoke. He was humble and meek, but he was absolute in the exercise of his judiciary power, because truth demanded it. He was God, and when acting as God, he used terms to denote the absoluteness of his power. As we have said before, anger against our fellow man is never lawful. Anger is an inordinate desire of revenge; it is the aversion of the mind from an object which we truly or falsely apprehend to have in some way injured us or threatened evil to us. In it we can distinguish the first natural motive of our nature, which tends to repel opposing agencies. This is simply the natural shock which precedes any full act of the will. There is the consequent voluntary assent of the will to the movement of passion, and this includes, in some degree, revenge. In fact, anger has been defined by some as the desire of revenge. Anger differs from hatred. Hatred is a settled state of the mind, anger is an actual surge of passion. A settled hatred may burst into anger by some small exciting cause or anything that recalls the wrong received. The words of the Lord exclude all forms of voluntary anger, and he classifies it under the head of murder, of which it is a certain participation.

People often allege in excuse of acts done in anger that the mind is so moved by the passion that it refuses to be guided by reason. The error of such persons is not so much in the specific act done in anger as in an omission to discipline the mind beforehand. Any rational nature can acquire dominion over the passions by the aid of the resources of religion; not indeed, at once, and without effort, but by serious and sustained moral discipline. From repeated acts of repression of the passions, a habit of self-control is formed; and then, when the great trial comes, the man finds help in the resource within him, being aided by God's grace.

To show forth the gravity of anger, the Lord specializes three degrees of it, with the punishments which they entail. The Lord was speaking to the Jewish people, and he assumed concrete representations from their institutions to set forth the status of the sin of anger before God.

Concerning the first degree of anger, the teaching of Christ is very plain. It is in substance as follows: "The Law says: He who kills shall be guilty of the judgment; and I perfect this law, so that he who is angry with his brother stands under the same penalty." Of course, it was not the intention of the Lord to revive the old procedure, so that the judges would also take cognizance of the crime of anger; but he used the conception that the Old Law had impressed upon their minds regarding the gravity of homicide to move them to realize the nature of anger as it appears before God. It was simply the shifting of the forum from the external world into the soul of man. The eyes of the Jews were turned outwards, to outward rites, outward purifications, outward laws. The Lord wished to move them to introspection. The nature of anger is the same as that of homicide. It is true that philosophers and moralists speak of a species of anger that is just, being simply a just zeal that wrong should be punished; and an excess in this zeal they classify as venial sin. Thus often the parent punishes the child in anger, but sins not mortally, because the act is for a proper end, and is only defective in the mode. But what Christ spoke of was anger properly so called, which is opposed to the charity which man owes to man, and this is *ex genere suo*, a mortal sin. This is the full import of the Lord's words.

The Lord limits himself to the position of the general truth. He does not deny that the passion admits of more and less, and that it may exist in such a degree that it is not grievous. The truth affirmed in Christ's teaching is simply that his law completes the Old Law by entering more intimately into the heart of man, and establishing the right law respecting the conceptions of the mind.

The next degree of anger is that which bursts forth in the opprobrious epithet רָקָא against the brother. רָקָא is the Syrian form of the רֵק of the Hebrew and the רִיקָא of the Talmudists. It is derived from the old Hebrew root רִיק, having the radical sense of the emptying of a thing. Hence the adjective signifies empty. When applied to a man as a term of vilification, it signifies empty-headed. It is believed that it was in common use among the people of that time and place, and hence the translators have left it in the original. It is a severe opprobrium upon a man, inasmuch as it throws contempt upon his intellectual endowment, which is one of the chief goods of man. The general line of Christ's argument is clear. All anger is a grave offense and entails a grave penalty from God. And as the degree of anger increases, the gravity of its punishment is represented by comparison of God's tribunal to the tribunals of their own institutions.

There was in existence at that time, in Jewish polity, an institution called the סִנְהֶדְרִין or סַנְדֵּרִין. The origin and date of this institution is involved in rabbinic fable. It appears evident that it did not arise till after the Greek influence in Jewish life, from the fact that the very name is a transliteration of the Greek *συνέδριον*, an assemblage of councillors. Edersheim places the date of its origin in the reign of John Hyrcanus, 135-107 B. C. It was the supreme tribunal in all matters relating to the Mosaic Law; and before it came greater causes and crimes for judgment. In the Jewish mind therefore the persuasion was natural that a cause which was reserved for the jurisdiction of the Sanhedrin must be very grave. Making use of this easy conception, the Lord teaches them the gravity of contumely.

Of the same nature but in excessive degree is the next case illustrated by the Lord. Outside the walls of Jerusalem, in a southerly direction, lies an arid, barren valley. It is the valley of Hinnom, the **גֵּיא־הַהֲנוֹם**, or more properly **בֶּן־הֲנוֹם גֵּיא** the valley of the son of Hinnom. Concerning its etymology, two opinions exist. Some derive its name from its owner, the son of Hinnom; while others believe that its name signifies the vale of sighs and groans.

One of the grossest forms of the Canaanitish religion was the worship of Moloch. The religion of those early Eastern pagans appealed to the sentiments of sensuality and terror. The impure rites of Ashtoreth, the Astarte of the Greeks, gratified the sensual appetite; while the cruel cult of Moloch inspired terror. Moloch was but another form of Baal, the god of the sun and of the forces of nature. We find but few images of Moloch, and the manner of his worship is very obscure. It is only from the Bible that we learn that the Jews worshipped Moloch by human sacrifices. Various representations of human sacrifices have been found on Assyrian monuments, but that the God was Moloch has not been determined.

The Jews became infected with this form of idolatry, and it is generally believed that under the impious kings of Judah, the idol of Moloch stood in the vale of Hinnom. According to the Rabbis, it was of brass, with a hollow interior. The body was that of a man seated with outstretched arms. The head was in form like that of a bull. To this idol the Jews offered their infants. The brazen image was heated by a fire from within to a great heat and the infant was placed in the outstretched arms, and quickly cremated. The Rabbis add that, during the burning of the infants, tambours were beaten, that the parents might not be moved by those dreadful cries. No other ancient authority has been found to corroborate this statement of the Rabbis.

Now of the site of the idol, and the cremation of the infants, we are assured by clear Scriptural testimony. In Leviticus the Lord spoke unto Moses: "Whosoever of the children of Israel, or of the strangers that sojourn in Israel, that

giveth his seed unto Moloch he shall surely be put to death; the people of the Lord shall stone him with stones."—Lev. XX. That the mode of offering the infant was cremation, is also assured by Scriptural testimony. Josiah "defiled Topheth which is in the vale of the son of Hinnom, that no man might offer his son or daughter by fire to Moloch."—II. [IV] Kings, XXIII. 10. This testimony is valuable in establishing the site of the idolatry in the vale of the son of Hinnom. The radical signification of Topheth is *tympanizatio*, the playing of tambourines; and it is the opinion of many that the place was thus named from the playing of these instruments to drown the cries of the burning babes. As Moloch was only a special form of the god Baal, the prophets often speak of his worship as the worship of Baal. Thus Jeremiah speaks: "They have also built the high places of Baal, to burn their sons with fire for burnt offerings unto Baal, which I commanded not, nor spoke, neither came it into my mind. Therefore the days shall come, saith the Lord, that this place shall no more be called Topheth, nor The Valley of the Son of Hinnom, but The Valley of Slaughter."—Jer. XIX. 6.

This does away with the opinion of some, that the human sacrifice to Moloch was a mere fire-baptism, a mere passing through a way flanked by fire, as Yahveh passed between the segments of the slaughtered animals.—Gen. XV. 17.

Aside from the intrinsic weakness of this opinion, it is disproved by the positive statement of the prophet that they cremated their seed to the god. There remains then only an uncertainty as to the mode of cremation. The opinion of the Rabbis has been mentioned, which places the infants in the outstretched arms of the incandescent idol. According to Fagi, quoted by Calmet, the hollow interior of the idol was divided into seven sections, which opened like an oven. The first was for the offering of flour; the second for the offering of a dove; the third for an ewe; the fourth for a ram; the fifth for a young bullock; the sixth for an ox; the seventh for an infant. Others hold that the infant was thrown into a fire kindled in front of the statue.

On account of the horrid rites performed in this valley it came to be synonymous for a place of horror; hence its name is

frequently employed by the Lord to signify the place of eternal punishment. Sometimes the Lord uses the term Gehenna alone; again, he calls it the Gehenna of fire. Gehenna denotes the awful state of separation from God; the fire signifies the pain of sense of the damned.

Here it may be remarked that the English versions weakly render all these members by translating the *ἐνοχος* of the Greek by *to be in danger of* the successive penalties. The proper sense of *ἐνοχος* in the context is *to be liable* to a penalty. The Lord declares that such acts render a man liable to the several penalties there enumerated.

One of the most opprobrious epithets among the Hebrew people was that of נָפֵל of which the Lord treats in the third member. Right reason dictates that man should estimate in the highest place the goods of greatest worth. Now among the goods of greatest worth in man, nothing is above his intellect and reason. Therefore this epithet is especially injurious, since it directly attacks these faculties of his being. Hence the Lord says that for such offence human tribunals are inadequate, and the only fit punishment is the infernal pit itself. There is danger here that the Lord's words be taken too literally. He is not here, in the capacity of a judge, drawing up a strict penal code, in which a graded system of punishment is established for offenses of varying gravity. He is not distinguishing between venial and mortal sins, nor establishing the existence of purgatory. He is simply by easy figures and modes of expression establishing that he who violates the love of his fellow man by grave internal hatred, or by opprobrious epithet, transgresses the law of God, and is liable to God's punishment, even to the punishment of Gehenna itself.

It is not strange that the Lord's words should be thus forcible. The whole law of God is reducible to the love of God and the neighbor. The anger and the epithets spoken of by Christ evince a state of mind in which there is no love of the neighbor, and this state of mind renders a man subject to the penalty of God, even the greatest. It would be to take the Lord's words too literally to condemn every man of grievous transgression that calls another a fool. Such a term may be

uttered in a slight degree of anger, and though in such case sinful, the offense may be venial. The Lord's words only declare that it is not only by injuring a man in his life that we become liable to the punishment of God, but also by injuring him in his honor and dignity as a man, and by anger against him. The term fool is taken to represent a very high degree of contumely, and this is a deadly sin. Neither is it necessary to use the term fool, in order to fall under the sentence of Christ. It is taken to represent every highly injurious epithet cast upon our brother. While avoiding an excessive literal sense of the Lord's words it must be conceded that we are very remiss in this iron age regarding the love of the brother. In the world's code there is no love of our fellow man. All about us men are following the code of the world, and imperceptibly we are drawn to accept more or less of it. Our horror of things is diminished from the fact that they are usual. The words of Christ should awake men from this torpor to a keen realization of the perfection of life that Christ demands in his followers.

In the twenty-third and twenty-fourth verse, the theme of love of neighbor is illustrated by another easy figure. A man, who has in some way injured his fellow man, brings an offering to sacrifice at the altar of God. The act is good, an important act, and very pleasing to God. But even when he comes to the altar to offer the gift, if the man's conscience tells him that his brother has received evil at his hands, he is bidden leave the offering and first be reconciled to the brother. The teaching here is very well adapted to the simple intellects of the people addressed. The deep sense of these words establish that no matter what act we would do for God, he will not accept it, as long as hatred of the brother lurks in our heart, or the injury of the neighbor remains unredressed. It establishes the imperative duty before all other duties of righting any wrong done to the neighbor. That a man already come to the altar of God to offer sacrifice should be obliged to leave the very altar itself, and go and first perform some other act, shows clearly to the rudest mind the imperative duty of such act. The words of the Lord put the reconciliation with the neighbor before the worship of God, for there can be no real worship of God, if the heart is not right towards our brother. It is hard

for our proud nature to seek a reconciliation with a man whom we dislike, and whom we have injured; but the law of God commands it. Many would perhaps cease from actual perpetration of the wrong, but they shrink from the humiliation of a reconciliation. But the words of Christ demand reconciliation, a redress of wrongs, an apology for insults, and a restitution of goods or honor.

The twenty-fifth and twenty-sixth verses contain a parable in which human prudence in worldly affairs is taken as an illustration of that higher wisdom which regulates the interests of the soul. The conception of the parable supposes that the adversary is a man who has been wronged by the person addressed in the discourse. Otherwise there would not exist the fear that the adversary might deliver such person to be cast into prison. The wrong has been done, and the adversary has not yet arrived at the tribunal to seek judicial redress. Now, humanly speaking, a wise counsel would be to effect an extra-judicial settlement of the affair. The neighbor can be moved to pity, to mercy, and to forgiveness of the offense. But the law knows no pity, no forgiveness, only justice. The law is not to be moved by tears, or by prayers; its nature is to exact what is due, even to the last farthing. The "quadrans" was the fourth part of the Roman as. The as was first a copper coin of twelve ounces. By successive reductions, it was finally reduced to one-half ounce. Hence, the fourth part of a half ounce of copper was taken by the Lord as the measure of the inexorable justice of the law. The Lord spoke of law as it existed in those days. It was certainly better to seek a reconciliation at the hands of the injured one, in whom the tender feelings of mercy and forgiveness would have place, than to bear the rigor of the stern, exact justice of the law. The Lord speaks of the administration of justice, as it is dispensed on earth by means of judge, and bailiff, and prison. It may be that through the teachings of Israel's sages this counsel was already familiar to the people. At all events, it was a truth of daily life, and all men could see its applicability.

Now the Lord applies this wise counsel to the higher order of moral truth. A man has injured his brother. If the

offender be powerful, or wily, he may elude human justice; but above all is God, the judge of man. In some way, that crime must be atoned. The order of the universe has been violated by the injustice, and it must be restored. It can be restored in two ways. It is restored when the offender deals with the offended brother, and makes such satisfaction that cancels the wrong done. This is the easier way. In it pity, mercy, human forgiveness have place, and God ratifies all, and the bond of perfection is restored again between man and man. There is another way, but it is the harder way. This second way is by the justice of God, which must come in to effect what man refused to do voluntarily. In this second way there is no room for mercy and forgiveness; for man rejected these by refusing to seek pardon from his offended brother. There is nothing left him, therefore, but the rigor of justice, stern and terrible. As we can not form a just conception of the malice of sin, so we can not rightly conceive the terrible weight of God's avenging justice. The Lord was gentle and merciful in his teachings, but whenever he spoke of the justice of God, his words become stern and terrible. In this life, God's forbearance and mercy are supreme. He waits, forgives, and graciously assists us here. He allows himself to be reviled, denied, despised and blasphemed, and he withholds his avenging justice. But with death, this order changes. Then justice and retribution have place. The Lord, with his perfect comprehension of these mighty truths, counsels to make use of the easier method.

It is vain to seek anything more in the parable. In all parables there are elements which pertain only to the natural fact. So here it is vain to seek the application of "the officer," and other details, in the higher order of truth represented in the metaphorical passage. Equally absurd is it to seek an endorsement of purgatory in this passage. Some have thought to infer from the words that Christ supposed a state after judgment where man might satisfy infinite justice, and pass thence. And this state could be no other than purgatory. This is evidently not the sense of the Lord's teachings. He does not specify the exact effect of God's judgment, whether it place the offender in purgatory or hell; but he simply says

that as human law deals rigorously with the man who refuses to make amends for the offense done his brother, so the justice of God will exact a penalty in the rigor of justice from any one who deals thus with his fellow man. If we have done any man wrong, we must either satisfy his just demands, or satisfy the infinite justice of God. In our selfishness, and in our pride, and in our greed, how often we trespass on the rights of our neighbor? The wrong done us we remember and magnify, but our offenses against others we soon forget. We do this because the Gospel is not the guide of our life.

MATT. V. 27—32.

27. Ye have heard that it was said: Thou shalt not commit adultery:

27. Ἦκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρήθη: Οὐ μοιχεύσεις.

28. But I say unto you, that every one that looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart.

28. Ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι πᾶς ὁ βλέπων γυναῖκα πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτήν, ἤδη ἐμοίχευσεν αὐτήν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ἑαυτοῦ.

29. And if thy right eye causeth thee to stumble, pluck it out, and cast it from thee; for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not thy whole body be cast into hell.

29. Εἰ δὲ ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς σου ὁ δεξιὸς σκανδαλίζει σε, ἔξελε αὐτόν καὶ βάλε ἀπὸ σοῦ: συμφέρεи γάρ σοι ἵνα ἀπόληται ἓν τῶν μελῶν σου καὶ μὴ ὅλον τὸ σῶμά σου βληθῇ εἰς γέενναν.

30. And if thy right hand causeth thee to stumble, cut it off, and cast it from thee: for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not thy whole body go into hell.

30. Καὶ εἰ ἡ δεξιὰ σου χεῖρ σκανδαλίζει σε, ἔκκοψον αὐτήν καὶ βάλε ἀπὸ σοῦ: συμφέρεи γάρ σοι ἵνα ἀπόληται ἓν τῶν μελῶν σου καὶ μὴ ὅλον τὸ σῶμά σου εἰς γέενναν ἀπέλθῃ.

31. It was said also: Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement:

31. Ἐρρήθη δὲ ὅς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, δότω αὐτῇ ἀποστάσιον.

32. But I say unto you, that every one that putteth away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, maketh her an adulteress: and whosoever shall marry her that is put away committeth adultery.

32. Ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι πᾶς ὁ ἀπολύων τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας ποιεῖ αὐτὴν μοιχευθῆναι, καὶ ὁ ἀπολελυμένην γαμήσας μοιχᾶται.

The τοῖς ἀρχαίοις in this text has only the support of L, M, and Δ of the uncial codices, of a few minuscule codices, and of the Peshitto and Vulgate among the versions. It is a very doubtful reading, but its omission or retention does not substantially alter the sense of the text. In the thirtieth verse, we find the reading βληθῆ εἰς γέενναν in E, G, K, L, M, S, U, V, Γ, Δ, et al.

In the thirty-second verse, instead of the ὁ ἀπολύων of our text, D, E, G, S, U and V have δς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ.

A great divergency exists among the codices regarding the last member of the thirty-second verse. D and some others omit it. N, E, K, L, M, et al., have καὶ ἐὰν ἀπολελυμένην γαμήσῃ. Tischendorf adopts this reading: but Westcott and Hort inclose the passage in parentheses as doubtful.

In Exodus, XX. 14, the commandment was given by Yahveh through Moses to man: "Thou shalt not commit adultery." The mere letter of the law forbade the carnal union of man and woman, outside of lawful marriage. It is by no means limited to an unlawful union which violates the marriage contract. The word פְּלִגְיָה of the original Hebrew signifies any unlawful carnal union. Under the head of adultery are also included all acts which partake of the nature of illicit carnal union. Christ spiritualizes this law by declaring that not only the external act, but any voluntary conception of it, which is consented to in the mind, constitutes an adultery in the heart of man. This is a classic text to prove the unlawfulness of morose sensual delectation. By the word woman is represented any individual of the human female sex. Now the only thing for us to elucidate here is the exact act of the mind that the Saviour specifies here as the looking upon a woman to lust after her.

It is evident that the looking, here condemned by Christ, is not the mere fixing of the eyes upon a creature of God. It is the making of the woman an object of the mind to the gratification of the carnal appetite. The Lord's teaching is spiritual, and the spirit of it carries more than the mere words state. He speaks of looking upon a woman, but thereby it is not stated that to sin it is necessary to actually see the woman with corporal eyes. A concrete example is chosen to inculcate that an internal consent to any unclean mental creation is a defilement of the heart, like in nature to the defilement that comes by the outward act.

In this we are aided by the ethical principle that it is unlawful to desire what it is unlawful to use and enjoy. Therefore every voluntary desire of such a relation with woman, which if acted would be unlawful, is forbidden by the words of Christ. The affection of the will is twofold. There is a real purpose and intention of obtaining a coveted good, and this is called an efficacious desire. This is the formal element of a human act, and constitutes one moral whole with the external act. This desire, of course, is subject to the same law that regulates the external act, and applied to the theme in treatment; even the Pharisees must have acknowledged that such intention was forbidden by the commandment against adultery. But there is another affection of the will, which is properly called morose delectation. This consists in a mere complacency in the thought of an illicit object, without the intention of obtaining it. It is called morose from Latin *mora*, not solely on account of the time which it endures, for it may be committed in a moment of time. But it is called morose from the fact that the mind rests in such contemplation after the intellect has adverted to the malice of the contemplated act or object, and also because very often the contemplation continues for some period of time.

Now although the words of the Saviour reprobate all internal acts of lust, they aim especially at this species of mental conceptions. And although the mere words speak only of the lusting after a woman, the spirit of his teaching extends the truth to every internal delighting in any impure object. It thus results that deliberate voluntary consent of the mind to

delight in the contemplation of any unlawful sexual object is a mortal sin. But two things are required. The object must be unlawful, and the act of the mind must be free and deliberate.

It is not difficult to see the reason of this prohibition. The sexual faculty in man is ordained for the propagation of the race. The propagation of the race is regulated by certain fundamental laws. Any disorder in these important laws is an attack upon the essential order of man's life. Now the Author of nature, to insure the preservation of the species, has given to man a strong propensity to exercise the act of generation; and there is attached thereto intense delight. But in the forbidden thought, man by the power of imagination represents this object as present in the ideal order, and thus induces a commotion of nature, which is a disordered act, because it is not ordained to a proper end. There is in it a certain frustration of nature's designs, inasmuch as the delight is in a measure experienced, without the end for which such delight was ordained; and moreover, that which is essentially evil is made the object of man's delight. Moreover, by such contemplation a psychologic change is wrought in the man. His animal nature is excited, and obtains the ascendancy. There is affected a blunting in all the finer spiritual powers of his being. There is in man a continual conflict between the animal powers and the spiritual powers, and the lust of the flesh raises the animal, and depresses the spiritual. Finally, there is something mysterious in the sanctity of purity of soul and the sinfulness of the opposite vice. In that awful primal mystery by which mankind became a fallen race, the sin of the flesh was involved more than we know; and in our re-entrance through Christ on our lost estate, our struggling against this disorder of our being is a necessary condition of salvation.

In the twenty-eight and twenty-ninth verses, the Lord promulgates the necessity of breaking away from the proximate occasions of sin. It may be that the theme was suggested by the foregoing doctrine, inasmuch as the love of woman is often such occasion of sin. Now it often happens that a man, who in his heart hates the sin he commits, falls into such sin, because he is attached to some object that is the occasion of that sin. In the estimation of men, among the organs of sense the most

excellent are the hand and the eye. Also the right member is always considered as the most valuable. Now these two members, so dear to man, are taken as symbols of any object about which man's heart has grown. And the Saviour says that if that loved object scandalize man, that is, draws him into sin, let him sever his connection therewith and cast it from him. Every word is full of meaning. Not only is the man to break this attachment to the object, but he is to repel the object, and establish a moral distance between himself and such object, that it may not fasten itself again upon him. That the Lord's words here are metaphorical is plainly evident. But some vainly endeavor to specify what particular thing is meant by the right eye, and what by the right hand. No particular thing is meant by either. The Lord simply by the powerful figure declares that if there be anything which draws a man into sin, and if the man hold it dear as his right hand or eye, he is to cut it off and cast it from him. It is hard to do this. The Lord had a human heart, and he knew how the human heart clings to the thing it loves. Hence to move a man to this necessary renunciation the Lord puts before him the fear of hell.

When man gives up some object of his affections, he feels the sense of loss. But the Lord says it is better to suffer this loss than to retain the object, and be thereby cast into hell. It requires an incentive even as strong as the fear of hell to avert man from a sinful love.

The illustration employed by the Lord is very beautiful. The simplest mind readily realizes how dear to man is such a member of the human body. It is taken as a concrete representation of the created things which a man loves most. The human heart is not to attach itself to anything which demands sin as the price of its possession. This creature may be riches, power, fame, or a human creature; love is strong, but what God commands he gives power to fulfill. A combat is demanded by God of man, that a man may prove himself worthy of Heaven. "But God is faithful who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able; but will with the temptation make a way of escape, that ye may be able to endure it."—I. Cor. X. 13. In the mighty conflict of the

forces which war for possession of man's soul these words are man's absolute trust. Christ knew the mighty power which creatures exert on man's heart. He arms him for the conflict, and presents to him the motive which is most potent with many men.

Now the words of the Lord apply to every occasion of sin, but it seems that he aimed them especially at sinful sexual love. In the history of mankind that love has ruined multitudes. All the other passions are weak, when compared to this. It blinds a man, and fills him with a consuming flame, *nil sapit amanti*. He has interest in nothing but the coveted object. In the wretched state of such a man, there is nothing that will move him more efficaciously than the fear of hell.

The thirty-first and thirty-second verses contain one of the most difficult passages of the Gospel. As the theme is treated more fully in Matthew XIX. 3 et seqq., to which passage parallel texts in Mark and Luke correspond, we reserve our exposition for that place.

MATT. V. 33—37.

33. Again, ye have heard that it was said to them of old time: Thou shalt not forswear thyself, but shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths:

34. But I say unto you: Swear not at all; neither by the Heaven, for it is the throne of God;

35. Nor by the earth, for it is the footstool of his feet; nor by Jerusalem, for it is the city of the great King.

36. Neither shalt thou swear by thy head, for thou canst not make one hair white or black.

33. Πάλιν ἤκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρήθη τοῖς ἀρχαίοις: οὐκ ἐπιορκήσεις, ἀποδώσεις δὲ τῷ Κυρίῳ τοὺς ὅρκους σου:

34. Ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν μὴ ὀμόσαι ὅλως, μήτε ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, ὅτι θρόνος ἐστὶν τοῦ Θεοῦ,

35. Μήτε ἐν τῇ γῇ ὅτι ὑποπόδιόν ἐστιν τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ, μήτε εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα, ὅτι πόλις ἐστὶν τοῦ μεγάλου βασιλέως.

36. Μήτε ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ σου ὀμόσης, ὅτι οὐ δύνασαι μίαν τρίχα λευκὴν ποιῆσαι ἢ μέλαιναν.

37. But let your speech be: Yea, yea; Nay, nay: and whatsoever is more than these is of evil.

37. Ἔσται δὲ ὁ λόγος ὑμῶν ναὶ ναί, οὐ οὐ: τὸ δὲ περισσὸν τούτων ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ ἐστίν.

In Leviticus, XIX. 12, the words of Yahveh are written: "And ye shall not swear by my name falsely; so that thou profane the name of thy God: I am the Lord." The Lord now perfects this law by deducing therefrom the law of reverence for God and all God's creatures, and the law of holy moderation in the Christian's conversation. The Saviour is here explaining the nature and spirit of the New Law, not measuring the exact degree of malice of a particular act; hence his teaching contains counsel and precept, undistinguished in the constitution of the perfect law of man. We must distinguish the precept from the counsel, on account of man's weakness; but in studying the nature and spirit of the teaching of Christ, it is well at times to view it as a whole in its grand spiritual perfection.

It appears from the Talmud and other authorities that the Jews made use of frequent oaths. It appears that they considered an oath lawful, if what was attested was true, or what was promised was fulfilled. Hence they had a system of greater and less oaths, which they used frequently in the different affairs of everyday life.

In dealing with oaths, we may consider them as they relate to God and to other things. In general an oath is a solemn attestation or imprecation in support of a declaration, promise, or vow, by means of an appeal to some personage or object regarded by the person swearing as high and holy. When the authority of God is invoked, an oath is a reverent appeal to God in corroboration of what one says or promises. Now the literalism of the Jewish teachers recognized not in the law respecting oaths the necessity of reverence for God and holy things. The truth of the assertion or promise was alone regarded. The New Law of Christ inculcates the spirit of reverence towards God and holy things. The name of God is holy, and the sanctity of God is assailed when his name and authority are rashly invoked in the ordinary affairs of life.

The Lord is directly attacking an abuse, but his teaching is universal in application. An oath is an act of religion, but the Jews never penetrated to the spirit of reverence which should pervade it. They were content to escape the condemnation of the mere letter.

In the first member of his declaration, the Lord *in genere* forbids oaths. The Pelagians, Anabaptists, Wiclefites and other heretics endeavored to prove from this text the unlawfulness of all oaths. That this sense is false, is proven from the Epistles of Paul, from the analogy of faith, and from the teaching and practice of the Church.

The words of Paul to the Romans, I. 19, contain an oath. He takes oath again in II. Cor. I. 23: "Moreover I call God for a witness upon my soul that to spare you I came not as yet to Corinth." Again, in Galatians, I. 20, he takes oath saying: "Now the things which I write unto you, behold before God, I lie not." Hence theologians rightly teach that it is of faith that under proper conditions an oath is lawful.

That an oath be lawful, what is attested must be true, just, and lawful; the cause must be sufficiently grave, and the act must proceed discreetly, prudently, and reverently. To maintain the ends of justice, it is permitted by public authority to take life. This is not countermanded by the command: Thou shalt not kill. So in the present case, the Lord had not in mind to forbid legal and necessary oath-taking, but only the irreverent spirit of the literalism of the Jews, that carried the oath into all the petty affairs of life, on the assumption that all was lawful, if the attested fact was true and the sworn promise was maintained. The question of oaths is treated by the Lord not solely on account of the disorder in the act itself, but to illustrate a new and broader mode of interpreting God's law.

Having regulated, in the first member, the issue regarding oaths, whose formal element was the appeal to the authority of the Deity, he, in the second place, discourages the minor oaths which had become common among the Jewish people. The bare letter of the Law said naught concerning these oaths, and the teachers of Israel restricted the Law to that which the bare letter stated.

The attitude of the teachers of Israel on this point appears again from Matt. XXIII. 16: "Woe unto you, blind guides, who say: Whosoever shall swear by the temple, it is nothing; but whosoever shall swear by the gold of the temple, he is a debtor."

It is the general teaching of the Church that an oath is constituted by the invocation of the more noble of God's creatures, in which his majesty and truth in a special manner are reflected. This is also true of things in an eminent manner consecrated to God's service. It is for moralists to examine and weigh the different formulas, and the objective and subjective conditions to be verified. One can never seize the substance of the New Law by mere attention to the casuistic measurement of sins. Such scientific knowledge is good, but more than that is needed. The Saviour did more than place before man the grosser crimes and their punishments. He called man to be perfect, and gave him the truths whereby to effect the command. Hence, there are the finer elements in his teaching that apply to the man who is doing more than merely avoiding hell.

Though the Saviour specifies only Heaven, earth, and one's head here, he includes in these all the sublime creatures of God, which may be made the object of an oath. Now in these matters the moralist asks what is mortal, and is but slightly concerned with what is in a less degree sinful. But Christ pointed out what was wrong and opposed to the spirit of the Gospel.

To take oath by Heaven without a proportionate and just cause is wrong, because Heaven bears the special relation to God of being his throne. Of course, the manners and customs of the people must be taken into account in weighing the malice of such an action. The common people usually do not advert to this special relation to God in the more eminent of his creatures, and therefore in their case, on account of the subjective condition of their minds, the formula is not an oath. But the Saviour spoke of the act *in se*, and as it disagrees with the spirit of the New Law.

The spirit of reverence for the Creator forbids also an oath by the earth, since it is designated by God himself as his

footstool: "Thus saith the Lord: The Heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool."—Is. LXVI. 1. Among the articles of furniture of a human habitation, the footstool holds a vile and menial place. Now when we look upon the earth with all its natural powers and beauty, and consider that it is only in the lowest rank of God's creatures, we are awed by the infinite majesty of him who can rightly call such a relatively mighty creature his footstool.

The people of that day recognized the formal relation of the earth to its Creator. This relation gave to the earth a certain sacredness, which disposed it as the object of appeal of an oath. And yet they felt themselves free in using these oaths indiscriminately, since no express prohibition of them existed. It was one of the many points where the narrowness of the letter was superseded by the breadth of the spiritual law.

Another oath common to the Jews was an oath by the holy city of Jerusalem. The human mind seeks a certain element of holiness in the object by which it corroborates a statement. Now in the Old Law, this element resided in Jerusalem. It had been selected by God as the place where his glory should dwell, and as a type of Heaven itself. Hence, in the estimation of the men of that age, it was a holy object. And this city, *sub formali respectu sanctitatis suæ*, was taken as the formal constituent of frequent and rash oaths, on the assumption that they thereby broke no divine law.

The divergency between the law of the letter and the law of the spirit is well brought out in the whole passage. One of the fundamental principles of a religious temper of mind is a reverence for everything that is related to God and his worship. In fact the religious man will continually elicit reverential thoughts of God from the evidences of God's act in creation.

Finally, the Lord forbids the act of taking oath by one's head. The Lord is illustrating the grand heights of reverence to which the New Law leads man. The Lord looked at the issue from his standpoint. He was the man of perfect discernment in the things of the soul's life. He grasped comprehensively the whole life of the soul, and he could note and set forth every imperfection in human thought, intention, and act. To confirm a statement by an oath by one's head

is against the right order of things for several reasons. First, this kind of oath is called an imprecation, in which one makes of such member a solemn pledge of the truth of a statement. And the constituting of such a pledge supposes the absolute dominion of the member in the person swearing, and this is false. Man has not such dominion over his members. He can not change the laws of nature regarding his life or his members. That dominion belongs to God. Of course, the Lord is speaking to people who interpreted such formula as a solemn oath, although they flippantly used it. Hence the deep philosophical reflections of the Lord apply to them. With us such formula of oath does not exist, and its utterance would be considered a jest.

In saying that no man can make one hair white or black, he understands this of a change by affecting the laws of nature. The Lord thereby impresses upon them a deep sense of God's ownership of men.

Finally the Lord lays down what should be the method of affirming or denying for the Christian. The only emphasis that the Lord allows is the repetition of the affirmative or negative particle.

The Lord here lays down not an absolute precept, whose infraction would be a mortal sin, but the grand law of perfection, whose infraction is a defect. He is placing before us a grand ideal to guide us in our communications with our fellow-men. The intercourse of Christians should be characterized by the spirit of moderation and reverence. In fact, not the bare letter but the spirit of that passage in the discourse of Christ should regulate all our conversations and dealings with our fellow men.

There is much divergency of opinion regarding the exact entity that is meant by the *πουνός* in the final clause. Many interpret it of moral evil in general, and explain the passage that all oaths participate in some degree of the evil principle. Of course, the Lord is not speaking of oaths justified by some legal or other just cause. They believe therefore that the Lord placed all these flippant and unnecessary oaths in one great class, and the class is evil, and he leaves indeterminate the grade of evil that they severally possess. The second opinion

differs from the first only in this, that Satan himself is understood by the *πονηρός*. Satan is not a passive personification of evil, but an active agent who conducts with great skill a warfare, and marshals under his standard every evil force in the universe. Everything that is opposed in any degree to that which is good in that same degree makes for Satan. He sets in motion those currents of thought and movements which weaken the supernatural in man, and debase man's life. Not only does he act on the individual by personal suggestion and incitation, but he is operative in all those general movements of the world's thought and action which are opposed to righteousness. The Lord was dealing with one such issue. He points out the falseness of the persuasion of the teachers of Israel; gives the reasons for his own position; and closes by establishing the grand norm of Christian life in the discourse of man to man. Now it matters not whether we understand by the *πονηρός*, evil in general, or Satan the head and promoter of evil. In fact, the comprehensive concept of evil includes all the evil forces of the world, together with their head, conceived as one complex principle of all evil. After having in general forbidden all oaths, the Lord extends the issue, and declares that everything that violates the calm, sober, reverential tenor of human speech is of the nature of such evil principle.

The grand ideal of perfect human life is not a vulgar conception, consisting in mere exemption from grave sin. It is the right development of all the powers that go to the building up of human life. It is that fine adjustment and equipoise of all the powers of intellect and will, and a vital growth in all those fine elements, which can not be known without careful soul study, nor attained without a fine love of high ideals, and a sustained discipline of our whole nature. Christ in person is the perfect model of all this perfection, and his words and example are the guide for the part that we may attain of it.

MATT. V. 38—48; LUKE VI. 27—37.

38. Ἦκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρήθη: ὀφθαλμὸν ἀντὶ ὀφθαλμοῦ καὶ ὀδόντα ἀντὶ ὀδόντος.

39. Ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν μὴ ἀντιστῆναι τῷ πονηρῷ, ἀλλ' ὅστις σε ραπίζει εἰς τὴν δεξιὰν σιαγόνα σου στρέψον αὐτῷ καὶ τὴν ἄλλην.

40. Καὶ τῷ θέλοντί σοι κριθῆναι καὶ τὸν χιτῶνά σου λαβεῖν ἄφες αὐτῷ καὶ τὸ ἱμάτιον.

41. Καὶ ὅστις σε ἀγγαρεύσει μίλιον ἓν, ὕπαγε μετ' αὐτοῦ δύο.

42. Τῷ αἰτοῦντί σε δός, καὶ τὸν θέλοντα ἀπὸ σοῦ δανείσασθαι μὴ ἀποστραφῆς.

43. Ἦκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρήθη: ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου καὶ μισήσεις τὸν ἐχθρόν σου.

44. Ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, ἀγαπάτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν (εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταρωμένους ὑμᾶς, καλῶς ποιεῖτε τοῖς μισοῦσιν ὑμᾶς) καὶ προσεύχεσθε (ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐπηρεαζόντων ὑμᾶς καὶ) ὑπὲρ τῶν διωκόντων ὑμᾶς.

45. Ὅπως γένησθε υἱοὶ τοῦ Πατρὸς ὑμῶν τοῦ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, ὅτι τὸν ἥλιον αὐτοῦ ἀνατέλλει ἐπὶ πονηροὺς καὶ ἀγαθοὺς καὶ βρέχει ἐπὶ δικαίους καὶ ἀδίκους.

46. Ἐὰν γὰρ ἀγαπήσητε τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς, τίνα μισθὸν ἔχετε; οὐχὶ καὶ οἱ τελῶναί τὸ αὐτὸ ποιοῦσιν;

27. Ἀλλ' ὑμῖν λέγω τοῖς ἀκούουσιν, Ἀγαπάτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν, καλῶς ποιεῖτε τοῖς μισοῦσιν ὑμᾶς.

28. Εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταρωμένους ὑμᾶς, προσεύχεσθε περὶ τῶν ἐπηρεαζόντων ὑμᾶς.

29. Τῷ τύπτοντί σε ἐπὶ τὴν σιαγόνα πάρεχε καὶ τὴν ἄλλην: καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵροντός σου τὸ ἱμάτιον, καὶ τὸν χιτῶνα μὴ κωλύσης.

30. Παντὶ αἰτοῦντί σε δίδου: καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵροντος τὰ σὰ μὴ ἀπαίτει.

31. Καὶ καθὼς θέλετε ἵνα ποιῶσιν ὑμῖν οἱ ἄνθρωποι, (καὶ ὑμεῖς) ποιεῖτε αὐτοῖς ὁμοίως.

32. Καὶ εἰ ἀγαπάτε τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς, ποία ὑμῖν χάρις ἐστίν; καὶ γὰρ οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας αὐτοὺς ἀγαπῶσιν.

33. Καὶ γὰρ ἐὰν ἀγαθοποιῇτε τοὺς ἀγαθοποιούντας ὑμᾶς, ποία ὑμῖν χάρις ἐστίν; καὶ οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ποιοῦσιν.

34. Καὶ ἐὰν δανείσητε παρ' ὧν ἐλπίζετε λαβεῖν, ποία ὑμῖν χάρις; καὶ ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἁμαρτωλοῖς δανείζουσιν, ἵνα ἀπολάβωσιν τὰ ἴσα.

47. Καὶ ἐὰν ἀσπάσῃσθε τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς ὑμῶν μόνον, τί περισσὸν ποιεῖτε; οὐχὶ καὶ οἱ ἐθνικοὶ τὰ αὐτὰ ποιοῦσιν;

48. Ἔσεσθε οὖν ὑμεῖς τέλειοι ὡς ὁ Πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος τέλειός ἐστιν.

38. Ye have heard that it was said: An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth:

39. But I say unto you: Resist not him that is evil; but whosoever smiteth thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also.

40. And if any man would go to law with thee, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also.

41. And whosoever shall compel thee to go one mile, go with him two.

42. Give to him that asketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee, turn not thou away.

35. Πλὴν ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν, καὶ ἀγαθοποιεῖτε καὶ δανεῖζετε μηδὲν ἀπελπίζοντες, καὶ ἔσται ὁ μισθὸς ὑμῶν πολὺς, καὶ ἔσεσθε υἱοὶ ὑψίστου· ὅτι αὐτοὺς χρηστός ἐστιν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀχαρίστους καὶ πονηροὺς.

36. Γίνεσθε οἰκτίρμονες, καθὼς ὁ Πατὴρ ὑμῶν οἰκτίρμων ἐστίν.

37. Καὶ μὴ κρίνετε, καὶ οὐ μὴ κριθήτε; καὶ μὴ δικάζετε, καὶ οὐ μὴ δικασθῇτε· ἀπολύετε καὶ ἀπολυθήσεσθε.

27. But I say unto you who hear: Love your enemies, do good to them that hate you,

28. Bless them that curse you, pray for them that despitefully use you.

29. To him that smiteth thee on the one cheek offer also the other; and from him that taketh away thy cloak withhold not thy coat also.

30. Give to every one that asketh thee; and of him that taketh away thy goods ask them not again.

43. Ye have heard that it was said: Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy:

44. But I say unto you: Love your enemies, and pray for them that persecute you;

45. That ye may be sons of your Father who is in Heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust.

46. For if ye love them that love you, what reward have ye? do not even the publicans the same?

47. And if ye salute your brethren only, what do ye more than others? do not even the Gentiles the same?

48. Ye therefore shall be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect.

31. And as ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise.

32. And if ye love them that love you, what reward have ye? for even sinners love those that love them.

33. And if ye do good to them that do good to you, what reward have ye? for even sinners do the same.

34. And if ye lend to them of whom ye hope to receive what reward have ye? even, sinners lend to sinners, to receive again as much.

35. But love your enemies, and do them good, and lend, never despairing; and your reward shall be great, and ye shall be sons of the Most High: for he is kind toward the unthankful and evil.

36. Be ye merciful, even as your Father is merciful.

37. And judge not, and ye shall not be judged: and condemn not, and ye shall not be condemned: release and ye shall be released:

These words do not contain absolute literal precepts. They, as far as words can avail, portray the genius of the perfect nature of the New Dispensation. It is difficult to adequately clothe in words the high nature of the New Law. It has heights on heights of perfection, which can not be described by words, but only perceived by the spiritual insight of the man purified by having passed through the first degrees of soul-cleansing.

As a norm of Christian life the Lord here represents the high and perfect ideal of the Gospel of non-resistance. The Lord taught us the absolute precepts of the Law, and then sets forth the perfect ideal to which the soul should aspire. His message would be incomplete, if it left the soul merely in its middle course, above sin, but yet not God-like. Hence the close of this chapter is one grand appeal to the soul to aspire after the highest ideals of perfection. We shall look in vain for the fulfilment of these words in the life of men of the world. In fact, their perfect observance is only found in the perfect saint. They contain the supreme bound of human perfection; but their spirit must in some measure move all those who follow Christ.

In inspecting these parallel passages, we first note that Matthew alone draws a comparison between the old and new orders of truth, whereas Luke enunciates only the perfect law of the New Covenant. The reason is obvious. Matthew wrote for Israel, to whom it was useful to show the evolution of the new order out of the old. The Jews were attached to that which of old had been given them, and it was necessary to move them upward, not by reprobating the old, but by showing the greater comprehensiveness of the new. Luke wrote for a more universal end. His Gospel had the spirit of Paul's preaching. Luke presented his truths to the whole world made up of all the races of men. Wherefore his conception of the truth and his forms of expression fit this universal end. The great Gentile world had no communication of divine truth. They had no position to which to cling; and hence, without adverting to the partial law that had preceded, Luke presents the law of the Gospel as an independent communication of truth. This difference in mode of presentation of the same truth is also observable in the fact that, where Matthew uses the word *ἔθνικοί*, Luke substitutes the term *ἁμαρτωλοί*. To the Jewish mind the *ἔθνικός*, the *Gentile*, was a synonym for a godless man, and an abomination. Such conception was true then. Hence St. Matthew could rightly employ the term to signify one who recognized no supernatural law or reward. But the advent of Christ changed the condition of the world; and no longer was the name *Gentile* synonymous with the

unbeliever. St. Luke, therefore, modifies the expression to fit his universal scope, and employs the word, *sinner*, to signify him who lives not for any supernatural ends. It seems quite probable that Christ employed the term used by Matthew, as being more forcible for his immediate hearers. The term is only used by him by way of illustration, and the substantial sense of the passage is in no way affected by Luke's modification.

There are some important variants in the text of Matthew. The first occurs in the Vulgate rendering of the thirty-ninth verse. In the Greek text of the Vatican and Sinaitic codices, we find *ραπίζει*, the present tense of the verb to strike. Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort endorse this reading. It agrees with Luke, and is undoubtedly the true reading. A number of Greek codices have *ραπίσει*, the future, and this the Vulgate has followed in rendering the verb *percusserit*.

Another variant occurs in the forty-first verse of Matthew. In Beza's codex this verse closes as follows: ὕπαγε μετ' αὐτοῦ ἔτι ἄλλα δύο. The greater number of codices of the Vulgate follow this reading. But the great authority of the Vatican codex and other great Greek codices plainly establish the reading: ὕπαγε μετ' αὐτοῦ δύο, which we have followed in the version. The present reading of the Vulgate destroys the harmony of conception of the entire argument. There is a certain grace in the plan of argument, if we follow the Greek text. The things are arranged in pairs. If one cheek is smitten, turn the other; if one garment is taken, freely give the other; and the harmony of plan would demand: If thou be forced to go one mile, go freely another. This harmony is broken, if we follow the Vulgate reading.

A very important variant appears in the forty-fourth verse. In the Vatican and Sinaitic codices the proposition has only two members ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν, καὶ προσεύχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν διωκόντων ὑμᾶς. Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort endorse this reading. It has the support of the Coptic version, of Cureton's Syriac version, of three minuscule codices, and of Theophylactus, Origen, Irenæus and Cyprian. Another reading inserts the members, εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταρωμένους ὑμᾶς, καλῶς ποιεῖτε τοῖς μισοῦσιν ὑμᾶς, between the two members found in

the Vatican codex. This reading has the authority of codices D, E, K, L, M, S, U, Δ, Π, and others; of several codices of the Vetus Itala, of the Gothic, Peshitto, Armenian, Ethiopian versions, and of several Fathers.

At the close of the verse the order of the words differs in the different codices. We are not aware that the order followed by the Vulgate exists in any Greek codex. In the Vatican and Sinaitic codices the series of words *ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐπι-
πραξόντων ὑμᾶς καὶ* is omitted, while in the codices which defend the aforesaid members these words are inserted immediately after the *προσεύχεσθε*. Though the weight of intrinsic authority gives to these readings a certain degree of probability, it is more probable that they were brought into the text from the Gospel of Luke. They all exist in the parallel text of Luke, and we know that it is of frequent occurrence, that passages have been transcribed from one Evangelist into the text of another, as though the writer were moved by the persuasion that in the discourses of the Lord the Evangelists should agree in everything.

In the forty-sixth verse, the future tense of *ἔχω, ἔξετε*, is found in D, and in a few other authorities. The Vulgate translation is built on this reading. The weight of authority and the context persuade us that the present tense should stand in this place. The reading adopted by the Vulgate may have arisen from the fact that this reward is a future thing. But this conception is not obscured by using the present tense; for by the figure of metonymy of cause and effect, the reward, which is the effect, and a future thing, is identified with its cause, the right acquired by Christian action, which is a present reality.

In verse forty-seven, the codices E, K, L, M, S, U, Δ, Π, and some few other authorities support the reading *φιλοῦς*, but the high authority of Σ, B, D, and Z, and of the versions render the reading *ἀδελφούς* certain. On the authority of the Vatican and Sinaitic codices, we also read *ἐθνικοί* in the same verse, which reading is followed by the Vulgate. The same codices which defended the reading *φιλοῦς*, support *τελώναι* instead of *ἐθνικοί*, and the Peshitto follows their reading. It is probable that the variant arose from an erroneous attempt to

make the term used by Matthew in the forty-seventh verse identical with that used in the forty-sixth verse. It is far more reasonable to suppose that, in the discourse of the Lord, the two different terms were used for the grace of diction.

In Exodus, XXI. 24, the *lex talionis* was enunciated as follows: "Eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot." In Leviticus, XXIV. 20, it is repeated in the same terms. Finally in Deuteronomy, XIX. 21, we read: "And thine eye shall not pity; life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot." The *lex talionis* was not restricted to the Hebrew people. Such law existed among the ancient Greeks and Romans, and they traced its origin back to the fabled Rhadamanthus. It was one of the statutes of the twelve tables. The interpretation of this law as given us by Josephus is as follows: "He that maimeth any one, let him undergo the like himself, and be deprived of the same member of which he hath deprived the other, unless he that is maimed will accept of money instead of it, for the law makes the sufferer the judge of the value of what he hath suffered, and permits him to estimate, unless he will be more severe."—Antiq. IV. VIII. 35.

Many believe that the words of the Jewish law in this passage are to be interpreted metaphorically. They believe the sense of the law to be that he who inflicted a personal injury upon a neighbor should be punished by a fine, which in the judgment of the judge should be held equal to the injury inflicted. They shrink from the conception of men proceeding to pull out a man's tooth, or pluck out his eye, or cut off his hand or foot, as a punishment for crime. We find no record of any such execution in the history of the Old Testament. But then why preface a statement by the solemn formula, thine eye shall not pity, if there was only a question of a pecuniary fine? The code of Aristotle recognized an actual forfeiture of a bodily member in like case. Again, in Deuteronomy the enunciation of the law begins by the statute of life for life. Every one understands this literally. How absurd then to twist the next members, which are closely united to the first, and promulgated in the most solemn way, into a mere fine? We believe therefore that, in the case of

injury of life or limb, the Mosaic law held the offender to the forfeiture of the same in his own person. Therefore it gave the judges the right to condemn such a criminal to be deprived of life or limb. It is nothing that such a conception of justice should conflict with our notions of justice. Society was then in a ruder state. The object of the law was not to satisfy the vindictive tendency in man, but to eliminate crime by the severity of justice. The execution of the sentence was not by private authority, but by the organized tribunal of judges. Moreover, it may have been that the actual execution of the sentence was rarely or never effected in Israel. Without doubt, murders were committed in that people, and punished by life for life, but the crime of depriving a man of a member is not a usual crime in any people. The severity of the punishment, and the strange nature of the crime may have caused the crime to be unknown in Israel. Again, it may have been that the judges were empowered to change the punishment into some work of satisfaction in favor of the injured party, and at his request. What we vindicate for the words of the law is that they sanction an actual forfeiture of life for life, and limb for limb. Such sense of the words existed in the popular mind, and was contemplated in the writer's mind. This true and literal conception of the sense of the words formed the value of the law in preventing all bodily injuries.

In contrast to this statute of the Law, the Lord places the Christian's norm of conduct. Under the three heads of injury to the body, injury to property, and injury to honor and liberty the Lord understands every species of injury receivable from the neighbor. Now it must be borne in mind that the Lord is not laying down principles of criminal and civil jurisprudence. He does not therein condemn human laws which provide a system of punishment for crime. The laws of society must be framed to meet the exigencies of a sinful world. They contemplate unregenerate man, as he is under the sway of natural motives. But the doctrine of Christ here propounded is a clear call to the spiritual man. The Christian must live in a world governed by other laws than these. He must observe human laws, and preserve the social order. But in his inner heart, there is another law unknown to the world,

though clearly enunciated; impossible to the world, though wise and beautiful. Man can not live the life of the world, and observe that inner law. The more man is imbued with the thought of the world, the more impossible will this sublime code appear. It condenses a world of thought into a few brief sentences. The fulness of the soul of Christianity is there portrayed. These words establish the grand ideal of Christian toleration of injuries. Such ideals are the hope of the world. They head us in the direction of the supernatural in motive and act. No man can raise that ideal higher. Few, very few attain to its fulness, but it benefits even those who come short of its utmost bound. It forms a point towards which to strive. Every effort in its direction makes for the kingdom of God. All that it proposes is intrinsically possible, and the higher man rises in the scale of being, the closer will he come to that perfect law of human life. Perhaps there is no passage in the Gospel where the contrast between the life of the world and the life of the Christian is more strikingly portrayed. The contrast between the spirit of the Old Law and the spirit of the New appears in this. The perfect observer of the Old Law placed his ideal in a conformity with the statutes of the Law. He never aspired to anything more perfect than faithful observance of the Law. That law regulated all the affairs of human life. It never contemplated the heights of spiritual perfection of the New. But the Christian, living under the laws of man to regulate social order, recognizes a higher law, to the observance of which no human tribunal coerces him. That law does not conflict with human statutes, but it forms a secret law of the spirit received only by the spiritual man, and followed only by him. The great, busy, noisy world goes on its way oblivious of the deep sense of these words, but the few of God's perfect ones keep them in their hearts as a motive of conduct that the world knows not of. A man may conceive his duty more narrowly, and escape reprobation, without reproducing in his life the fulness of the perfection here proposed. From the minimum required to keep a man out of hell to the highest bound of human perfection there are many degrees. The Lord stands at the top, and invites us to the highest; and if the aspiration is

fixed there, the achievement will be something, and the words will have a profitable effect even though the summit be not reached.

The term *πονηρός* in the clause: "resist not him that is evil," signifies the character of one who unjustly injures the person, property, or fame of the one addressed in the discourse. The Lord first enunciates the broad fundamental principle of non-resistance to evil, and then proceeds to illustrate it by concrete illustrations.

Knowing perfectly the nature of the human mind, the Lord did not propose his doctrines as abstract principles, but employed parables and concrete examples. He takes, therefore, a blow upon the cheek as an example of bodily insult and injury. The example is aptly chosen, since it is an action that the natural bent of human nature is quick to resent, and it has been received of old in the code of the world as sufficient provocation for a quarrel. It is not the pain or the lesion inflicted that moves the irascible in man, but the insult which human nature feels in receiving such blow. Now, of course, the specific act is made a head under which is included every species of insult and injury.

Some have found a difficulty in the fact that Matthew speaks of a blow upon the right cheek. In Luke we find no designation of the particular cheek. Of course the substance of the proposition is simply, if smitten on one cheek turn the other. But in explaining the detail of the right cheek, as mentioned by Matthew, we are led to the following reflections. A blow is usually delivered with the right hand, and a blow thus delivered would not light on the right cheek, but on the left. Discarding certain improbable opinions, which have been advanced in solution of this, we are led to the following conclusions. The right side of the body and the right members are usually mentioned in statements where a side of the human body, or a member is used for illustration. Now it is certain that the Lord simply followed the custom of human speech in giving priority to the right member. In the words of Maldonatus: "*Non cædendi sed loquendi usum Christus secutus est.*" It is only a mind filled with a spirit of equivocation that will find anything incongruous in this statement of St.

Matthew. The proper object for the mind to rest on is that a blow has been received on the cheek, and the right cheek is mentioned, in accordance with the general priority of the right member, without adverting to the exact mode of delivering the blow. Moreover, if the person delivering the blow be not directly in front, but standing at the right side, as frequently happens, the blow with the right hand would light upon the right cheek. But it seems that no thought was given by the speaker to the mode of delivering the blow. There is a beautiful antithesis in the contrast of the New Law with the Old. The Old Law said: Like punishment for like injury. The perfection of the New Law says: Seek not thy vindication, but offer thyself to receive another injury from him who has smitten thee. The words give man the perfect spiritual law in his dealings with man. In this and the following sentences, the Lord stops at no half measures. It is as though he for a moment lost sight of selfish man, engrossed with his own interests, and looking aloft, contemplated man on the highest plane on which he can stand. Now the spirit of these words should be the spirit of the Christian's life. The changed customs of people will only modify the details. Prudence also will regulate the deeds of a life which moves in this spirit. The conscience of man can always have recourse to these sublime words to be certified whether the spirit of Christ rules the conduct of man. They are not for the forum of the world; they are too perfect for the vulgar life. They are paradoxical to the worldly sense. Indeed, men have gone so far as to assert that this code, if put into effect, would subvert society by removing all restraint from the wicked. This view is founded on a misconception. These high counsels of Christ are not intended to take the place of human law. A certain divine Providence rules in human society, and prevents that the wide-spread wickedness of man should subvert all law and order. But within society's system of laws is this higher law, which regulates acts which are above the domain of human law. No danger will ever come to society from this grand Gospel of non-resistance. But the more of this spirit that pervades society, the nobler and better will be the life of man.

It may never be verified in our lives that we be struck on the cheek by any man, but it will be oft verified that we are called to submit to actions of the class of which this is taken as a representative. The words exhort us to perfect forgiveness of injuries, to disarm wrath by the power of meekness.

By reflection we can form in our minds an idea of the disposition of mind that would be in the mind of the man, who having received a blow on the cheek, would in perfect meekness turn the other. That disposition of mind should be the object of our aspirations, prayers and efforts, and if the disposition be strongly fixed there, the application of it to the various events of life will follow logically. But the enterprise is a difficult one. All the propensities of crude nature rise up against the counsel of Christ. A mightier power of the supernatural must rise up and put down the "old nature." Whenever the follower of Christ receives a personal insult or injury, filled with the spirit of these words, let him say: This is a blow on the cheek, and my duty is plain. It may safely be left to the conscience and judgment of each follower of Christ to determine the mode in which to turn the other cheek.

The spirit of these words moved Christ in his own life. In Isaiah he says: "I gave my back to the strikers, and my cheeks to them who plucked out the hair; I hid not my face from shame and spitting."—Is. L. 6. And again: "He was oppressed, and he was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth: he is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he opened not his mouth."—Is. LIII. 7.

Some allege Paul's action in Acts, XXIII. 3, as contrary to the spirit of these words of Jesus. There, when the high priest Ananias gave order that they that stood by him should smite Paul on the mouth, Paul made answer: "God shall smite thee, thou whited wall." In answer to this, we must observe that Paul's words were not moved by the personal injury done to him. It was a denunciation of the perfidy and wickedness of the high priest. Moreover the stroke given to Paul was in hatred of the doctrine that he taught; and interpreting the high priest's treatment of him as a manifestation of his hatred of Christ, Paul is moved to indignation against the false and impious man.

In that address St. Paul endeavors to arouse the high priest to a consciousness of the injustice which moved him to cause St. Paul to be struck. The address was aimed to denounce the wicked act itself, and not to avenge a personal injury. The spirit of forgiveness moves not a man to be supine and indifferent to evil; but it enlarges a man's heart to prompt mercy toward one who has aimed an injury at himself.

Paul had not finished his work, and he resorted to legitimate means to escape from his accusers, that he might further testify of Christ in Rome. Moreover, when Paul demanded his rights as a Roman citizen, he was not departing from the spirit of the law. There, it was not a question of revenging a personal injury, but of availing himself of legitimate means to prolong his life and liberty to labor for Christ. The words of Christ do not inculcate the renunciation of one's rights before the tribunals, but the patient bearing of wrongs received from our fellow men.

The next example of Christ contemplates a case where a man endeavors by unjust means to deprive us of some possession, even a very necessary possession, and the counsel of Christ is to repay such injustice by a voluntary surrender of another such necessary possession. The ordinary raiment of people of ancient times consisted of the tunic and cloak. The tunic was the universal garment for both sexes. It was in form like a long shirt. In women it always reached to the feet. As worn by men, it sometimes extended to the feet, and sometimes was a little shorter. Its loose folds were usually gathered about the loins by a girdle. With the Hebrews it was usually made of wool or linen, and was the immediate covering of the body. The cloak was an outer covering worn at the approach of evening, or at other times as a protection against the cold. A man's raiment might well be considered as the last thing that he would be willing to part with. Indeed the Law protected a man in the possession of this, even against the obligation of a pledge. In Exodus, XXII. 26, it is written: "If thou take thy neighbor's raiment to pledge, thou shalt deliver it to him by that the sun goeth down. For that is his only covering, his raiment for his skin. In what shall he sleep? And it shall come to pass that, when he crieth unto me, that I will hear;

for I am gracious." It is therefore with design that the Lord specifies the tunic and the raiment. It is to prove that the spirit of renunciation should be universal, and stop at nothing, not even the most necessary thing. The example supposes that the contention of the one claiming the garment is unjust. If the follower of Christ were bidden give the one garment to such a claimant, the act would seem to us sublime. Such a man might say: I have at least left to me a cloak to cover my nakedness, and protect me from the cold. But the words of Christ bid him give the cloak also, and retain nothing. It is the absolutely perfect degree of cession of our rights, the perfect degree of detachment from the world.

How the grandest things that we have ever done in this spirit sink into insignificance when compared to this high standard? And yet the fulfilment of the counsel to the letter is possible, and the best thing that man can do. It is said of St. Francis of Assisi, that after renouncing his right to his father's property, St. Francis restored to him also the garments that he wore. The thing seems hard to us, because we look at it from such a low plane. No man can be a perfect saint in one thing and a sinner in everything else. If we, by patient discipline and prayer, could lift ourselves into the plane from which Christ surveyed things, our vision would be corrected. Had he told us that the perfect fulfilment of this counsel were actually required in order to gain eternal life, we might shudder. It is not so. It is a high and heavenly ideal of human perfection, fixed high, as an object of aspiration and activity. It is not an ordinary canon of human conduct, to be put in practice like a casuistic decision of moral theology, but a high ideal towards which to rise; and every step towards it is a step upwards to a broader and nobler plane of human life.

Christ's conception of human life is that of a toilsome journey upwards from the low and sordid plane of the world's life, through various degrees, even to the high plane of perfection. He has legislated for all the degrees, and to lead us on in that upward journey, he has placed at the top these examples of perfection.

There is a slight variance between Matthew and Luke in the mode in which they conceive the cession of the garments. Of course, the order of ceding them is not essential, and the proposition of the Lord regarded not the order, but the act of surrender of both garments. Matthew seems to contemplate a man clad in his tunic. Let us for composition of place, locate the scene in the man's abode. His hard and grasping neighbor comes to take away even the tunic from his back. And the man is bidden to cede the garment, and to put forth his hand and take also his necessary cloak and give with it.

Luke on the other hand seems to take for example a man clad in tunic and cloak. For such an example, the composition of place may be the same or otherwise. The aforesaid unfeeling neighbor presses a suit to take away the cloak, and the follower of Christ gives it, and then voluntarily divests himself of his tunic, and gives that too. The ordering of the action is logical in both cases, but the original conception is slightly different in detail.

It is not the mere letter of this sublime counsel that Christ contemplated. In plain illustrations he has established the supreme norm of self-denial. By this teaching he calls us to the spirit of renunciation and mercy. A man may follow the spirit of that divine teaching even to the heroic degree, and give all.

The spirit of these words should fix itself in the Christian as a disposition of soul regulating his attachment to his wordly goods. A selfish insisting on our rights, of whatever nature, is strongly opposed to the spirit of Christ's law. It is needless to add that Christ supposes that the act of renunciation should not leave in the mind any bitterness or contempt. It should proceed in perfect charity and serenity of mind.

In the various religions and philosophies of the world there is nothing like to this. Such sublime philosophy could only come from Heaven. Its value is not limited to the perfect. Its spirit, in some degree, pervades all the followers of Christ, and makes them less selfish.

The third example proposed by Christ is founded in a usage unknown in our life. As it was strange to the Gentile world, it has been omitted by St. Luke. To secure celerity in

their public couriers, the kings of Persia empowered these couriers to impress into their service men, beasts, and boats when need required. These couriers transmitted the royal edicts and letters throughout the Persian Empire. The system was organized by means of relays of mounted men, and one courier handed the message to the other mounted courier, so that the course was unbroken. The royal messages were called in Persian انگاره *engare*, "writings," hence the Greek term ἀγγαρεύω, and the *angariare* of the Latin Vulgate. These couriers are mentioned in Esther, VIII. 10—14. The Persian domination introduced the usage into Palestine, and it was extremely odious to the people. In the peace proposals which Demetrius Soter sent to Jonathan, it was promised that the beasts of the Jews should not be impressed for public service.—Jos. Antiq., XIII. II. 3. This testimony establishes the fact that the usage continued under the Seleucidæ, and that it was odious to the Jewish people. The term is used three times in the New Testament; in the present passage, and again in Matthew, XXVII. 32, and in Mark, XV. 21, where the Jews constrain Simon of Cyrene to bear the cross of the Saviour. It is probable that the usage gave rise to abuses, wherein the more powerful ones exacted unjust service from the weaker members of the Jewish commonwealth, and it seems to be this to which the Lord has reference. The example is different, but the doctrine is the same. It is the application of the gospel of non-resistance and renunciation to a fact of life, wherein one's right to liberty and honor has been invaded. All that has been said of the preceding examples applies to this also, and the Lord takes the most hated violation of man's rights as an example, in order to raise the standard of Christian meekness and charity.

Wherever human society exists, there social inequality exists. Now the proper attitude of the Christian towards his brother in distress is outlined here by Christ. In keeping with the general tenor of the discourse, he has set forth the highest degree of charitable giving. Give to every one whom need prompts to ask. You may do less, and absolve your soul from sin, but you can not do more. There is nothing conceivable above the counsel of Christ. In its fullest degree it leads to no

absurdity. It shuts out all calculating on the personal privation that may result from such giving. It reserves nothing to self; for the perfect Christian has nothing here. His heart is attached to nothing but God, virtue and Heaven. With a noble indifference, he lives above the things of earth. With him human want always outweighs his private advantage. The grasp of the Christian is firm on the things of Heaven, light on the things of earth. What a sublime rebuke is in these words against our modern Christian, who lives in affluence, and either gives nothing to the poor, or doles out grudgingly some insignificant offering to those who suffer want?

Some interpret the universality of the counsel, Give to every one that asketh of thee, in this wise: that we should not regard the person of the one asking, whether he be friend or enemy, one in favor or out of favor, but that we should only have regard to his need. The force of the universal proposition seems to be that we stop at no consideration whatever, while we have anything to give, and a man is in need. Some restrict their charity by the consideration that they have already done a certain amount; others by the consideration that they or their families are not in as good condition as they desire; others by the consideration that the state should support the poor; others by the consideration that the poor are indolent or vicious. Of course, prudence is the guide in the exercise of all virtues. It would not be following the spirit of this sublime doctrine to blindly give aid to one whom the very aid would confirm in idleness or drunkenness. But where human want exists in such a manner that it has a claim on charity, then the universal proposition of Christ excludes every consideration of self, and prompts a man forthwith to relieve the need, being nobly oblivious of his own inconvenience.

Luke's account has some factors omitted by Matthew. With the counsel to give to every one who asketh, Luke joins another counsel, "and of him that taketh away thy goods ask them not again." The full sense of these words is the renunciation of the right of restitution by the Christian whose property has been unjustly taken away. To be sure, a man may without sin demand the restitution of such property, but it is more perfect to renounce this right. The words of the Lord

contain no impossible Utopian philosophy, but the perfect law of charity and indifference to sordid issues. Injustice is not thereby encouraged to the harm of the social law. Forsooth we might imagine a metaphysical case, in which a wicked man, taking advantage of the universal adoption of this principle of renunciation might amass wealth by injustice, and live securely by the immunity guaranteed him by this law. But in such case the counsel would no longer hold, for the repression of crime would be a just motive to proceed against such offender; and therefore the Christian would move not with the desire to have his property again, but for the protection of the public good. Moreover, in applying these counsels, we are not to consider the metaphysical man, but the historical man, as he is found in the midst of society. We shall find that society was never injured by the number of saints who practiced the perfection of Christ's law. The counsel regards the act *in se*, and establishes that it is nobler to surrender a right to property than to claim it. It is often verified in society that in some way a man is deprived of some portion of his goods which are held or have been appropriated by another. By recourse to a suit at law this property might be recovered. The Christian has such a right, but there is also proposed to him the higher law of action, to renounce his claim. The counsel goes against every worldly instinct in man. The goods of the world look big in our eyes. But seen from that standpoint whence Christ viewed the world, they are but as straw and rags. We may not be able to rise to the supreme height of this counsel, but some of its spirit should come into our lives, to temper our excessive attachment to our rights and to our property.

In the next sentence, Luke's text contains a practical canon of universal application to regulate our dealings with others: "And as ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise." This passage appears in Matthew in Chap. VII. 12. The ordering of the discourse is the proper work of the Evangelists themselves, and in such ordering, Luke excels. Though his account of the discourse is briefer, he has ordered the chief elements in logical sequence, and a glance at the context of the passage, as it appears in the two Evangelists, will convince one that Luke has introduced the passage in the

right place. The counsel is not confined to the New Law. When the elder Tobias believed death to be imminent, among the counsels which he gave his son was this: "That which thou art unwilling another should do to thee, see that thou doest not to another." The counsel is sublimely plain. It requires no difficult mental operation to put ourselves in the neighbor's place. It is but another expression of the great truth: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." It is no abstract principle, but a concrete law comprehensible by the rudest mind. The natural love of man for himself and for his good is strong; this unerring canon makes that the measure of man's treatment of his neighbor. If that canon were adopted, all strife would cease, all injustice would cease. When the human heart is filled with ill-will or hatred towards a fellow-being, all things that come from the hated individual are displeasing. A man thus disposed might be led to reason thus: The law of Christ enjoins that we should do unto others as we would that men should do unto us. It is well. I wish that my enemy should not do me any offices of kindness. My hatred makes odious to me all things that come from him. I wish that he keep out of my sight, and trouble me not, therefore I will treat him in like manner. This is fallacious. The precept of Christ is, that we do unto every man, even our enemy, as we would that every man should do unto us. There is no right minded man who is willing that all men should avoid him, and withhold all offices of kindness from him.

All the philosophy of man's dealings with man is condensed into that one simple sentence. It is applicable to all the departments of human life, to all the grades of society, and to every species of human act. By its use we are readily brought to the realization of even the most delicate wrong done to a neighbor. It is the ultimate criterion of justice and charity between man and man. The principle itself only contains a method of practical judgment of conduct. The degree of malice of an infraction of the precept must be judged by the nature of the act.

Another office that the Christian is bidden perform, is to lend to a person in need.

To lend may be taken in two senses. First, it may mean to give the temporary use of a thing without compensation, on the condition that the thing itself, or its equivalent in kind, be returned. Secondly, it may mean to grant for temporary use, on condition of receiving a compensation for the use of the thing, and ultimately the thing itself or its value. In this second sense, money is put at interest. In the Law of Moses, the first mode of lending was commanded, and the second mode was forbidden. In Exodus, XXII. 25, we read: "If thou lend money to any of my people with thee that is poor, thou shalt not be to him as a usurer, neither shalt thou lay upon him usury." And again in Leviticus, XXV. 35-37: "And if thy brother shall have become poor, and his hand fail with thee, then thou shalt relieve him; as a stranger and a sojourner shall he live with thee. Take thou no usury of him or increase; but fear thy God: that thy brother may live with thee. Thou shalt not give him thy money upon usury, nor give him thy victuals for increase." This law only had regard to the lending to an Israelite. The Law allowed an Israelite to exact usury from a Gentile. In Deuteronomy, XXIII. 20, it is written: "Unto a stranger thou mayest lend upon usury; but unto thy brother thou shalt not lend upon usury."

The law of Christ substantially modified this legislation. It broke down the racial distinction between brother and stranger, and established the universal brotherhood of man. Now Matthew conceives the matter of lending, as it regarded the Israelites themselves. He says naught of usury. It seems quite probable that the *pars prohibens* of this law was observed with more fidelity by Israel than the *pars præcipiens*. There is no natural incentive to lend to a man without interest. Hence those, whom the law explicitly forbade to take interest for a loan, may well be believed to have often turned aside from such a pleader. The words of Matthew are singularly expressive to signify the way in which a man declines the troublesome suit of another.

Luke treats the issue in a different manner. He looked at a broader world than did St. Matthew.

Now Luke contemplates a case where the request of a loan comes from a man who is in such circumstances that little or

no hope appears that he will be able to pay back the principal. Luke seems to prescind from the subject of interest, and to consider only the aspect of payment of the borrowed goods. The *τὰ ἴσα* of the thirty-fourth verse of Luke plainly indicates this. He does not say by way of illustration that sinners lend to sinners to receive *interest*, but to receive *τὰ ἴσα*, *as much*, in return. Luke says that such lending springs from no supernatural motive, and is entitled to no supernatural reward. The force of the *χάρις* of the thirty-fourth verse is supernatural merit with God. The reasoning of Luke is very plain. To lend money on good security with the intention that it shall be safely returned is not a work of charity, but a business transaction, inspired by a mere natural motive. The conception of the Christian life in the mind of the Lord is that of a life regulated by supernatural motives. Hence the Christian is exhorted to a supernatural love of man; and as regards the matter of lending, he is exhorted to lend where there is no hope of a return of the principal.

To some persons these words appear to have no practical signification. They put them aside as containing some mysterious sense with which they are not concerned. To be sure, the spirit of the words is more profitable than the mere letter. The letter was influenced somewhat by the popular modes of thought and expression, and the peculiar circumstances of the time; the spirit is influenced by nothing, and is eternal.

By a perverse way of looking at this sublime doctrine, we can make it appear ridiculous. Let us suppose, for example, that a man by thrift has acquired a competence for his family. He becomes moved by the present text of Scripture, and begins to lend to every one that approaches him, never questioning the borrower's honesty or ability to repay. The unworthy take advantage of this. The man is soon reduced to poverty, and his family are destitute. Is this the proper effect of the Gospel of Christ? We answer, No. Scriptural language must be interpreted by its own proper norm. It is unlike all other forms of expression. It often establishes laws of conduct for all men by proposing the supreme degree of the several virtues as a grand high aim towards which to aspire and labor. The utmost bound of perfection in the virtue of detachment from

the world is to give all, and possess nothing. This grand truth must be the guiding spirit in man's relations to earthly goods. That spirit never changes, but the actual application of the great truth to practical usage is subject to various modifications, resulting from the way of life of every man. Prudence regulates this and every other virtue. The spirit of the words, first of all lessens man's grasp on the things of earth. The spirit of the words corrects man's intention, so that he makes of such goods not an end of human life but a transitory means. They contemplate a case where a man has something which he can lend, and where the petitioner is in real need. In substance, Christ says: "If thou hast the goods of this world, and thy needy brother cometh to thee, asking a loan, turn not away from him for the reason that his security is not good." Many a time a poor man, who could offer no security to the money-lenders has been able to save his home by the kind office of some one who guided his life in the spirit of these words.

There is some difficulty in the thirty-fifth verse caused by Luke's strange use of the verb ἀπελπίζειν. The classic sense of the term is twofold. When used with a direct accusative, it signifies to cause one to despair, and this is its general sense in classic writers and in the Septuagint. Thus it is used in Eccli. XXII. 26; XXVII. 24, II. Maccab. IX. 18. Many codices of the Vetus Itala and of the Vulgate have the reading *nihil desperantes*, founded upon this sense of the verb, and this sense is defended by Schegg, Schanz, Fillion, Wetstein, Meyer, Grimm and others. The sense is apt. The reason which would move a man not to give, in the case proposed, is the absence of the hope of receiving the equivalent back again. Now the Lord says: Let not this absence of hope move you; give the loan to the needy one, for you can not lose it; the Lord himself will be your remunerator. No man needs despair of the security of a loan, when the Lord becomes the surety. The Syriac takes the transitive sense of the verb, and translates it: "Thou shalt not cut off the hope of a man." To obtain such sense from the Greek, the μηδέν must be changed to μηδένα, which is found in no Greek codex.

The sense of the Vulgate seeks its justification in a peculiar use of the word ἀπελπίζειν. This verb is made up of the preposition ἀπό and ἐλπίζειν. Now the expression ἐλπίζειν ἀπό τινος would mean to hope for something from a person. Those who defend the sense of the Vulgate believe that Luke retained the sense of this expression in compounding the verb with the preposition. There are precedents for such use of compound verbs in classic writers. It must be conceded that the great commentators and critics stand for this sense of the expression. It is supported by Toleti, Jansenius, Lucas of Bruges, Cajetan, Cornelius à Lapide, Calmet, Bisping, Grotius, Castalius, Casaubonus, Bengel, Rosenmüller, Kuinoel, DeWette, Ewald, Bleek, Keil and others.

From the sense of the Vulgate many theologians have tried to draw a precept against receiving interest for money. It is not given us at this time to enter into the vexed question of usury. Suffice it for our present purpose to point out, that Luke in this place does not contemplate the case of interest for money, but the granting of a loan in such circumstances wherein a man would have no hope of a return of the equivalent of the loan. The preceding context and the words themselves plainly evince this. His words are to give, expecting *nothing* in return. What right have we to interpret that *nothing* to signify no interest? But they say thus enunciated the doctrine would be too difficult. It would be too difficult were it placed upon man as a precept, but it is also a sublime counsel, containing the supreme degree of charity in lending.

The remaining verses of the passage inculcate the perfection of the love of enemies. In Matthew we find this perfect law of charity contrasted with the Old Law: "Ye have heard that it hath been said: Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy." In Leviticus, XIX, 18, the love of the neighbor is commanded: "Thou shalt not avenge, nor bear any grudge against the children of thy people; but thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself; I am the Lord." The word signifying neighbor in the original is רֵעִי. Now with the Hebrews, this term was never applied to any man but an Israelite. It signified that relation between man and man

which was founded on the consideration that they formed one people. Hence by this precept, no general love of brotherhood of man was established. Brotherhood among the Jews was founded on the fact that they had Abraham as a common father.

The second part of the citation of Christ, "and thou shalt hate thine enemy," is not found in express terms in the Old Law. Hence in the second member, some commentators believe the contrast to be not between Christ's law and the Old Code, but between Christ's law and Pharisaic teaching. To a superficial reader this is the easier view, but a deeper view of the passage convinces us that Christ is here not correcting the falsity of Pharisaic teaching, but perfecting the weakness of the Law itself. Israel formed a unique people in an idolatrous world. Superstition and crime had so affected the men of that age that by God's own statement the cup of malice was full, and he decreed to destroy the dwellers of Canaan by the hand of the Israelites. Hence the Israelites were taught by God himself to look with horror and abomination upon the surrounding tribes. An exception was made in the case of the Edomites on account of the brotherhood of Jacob and Esau the father of Edom, and in the case of the Egyptians, in gratitude for the favors given to Joseph and his brethren by Pharaoh: "Thou shalt not abhor an Edomite; for he is thy brother: thou shalt not abhor an Egyptian; because thou wast a stranger in his land."—Deut. XXIII. 7. The very manner in which this exception is stated, evinces that the intent of the Law was that they should abhor the other tribes and nations. In Exodus, XVII. 14, the Israelites are bidden to wage eternal warfare with Amalek; and in Deuteronomy, XXV. 19, Moses commanded: "Therefore it shall be, when the Lord thy God hath given thee rest from all thy enemies round about, in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee for an inheritance to possess it, thou shalt blot out the remembrance of Amalek, from under Heaven; thou shalt not forget it." In Exodus, XXIII. 22, God declares that he himself will be an enemy to the enemies of Israel; and in the same chapter, they are commanded to exterminate all the idolatrous tribes from the land. In Numbers, XXV. 17, Israel is commanded to vex the

Midianites, and smite them. In Deuteronomy, VII. 2, the Lord gives this terrible command: "And when the Lord thy God shall deliver them (the Hittites, and the Girgashites, and the Amorites, and the Canaanites, and the Perizzites, and the Hivites, and the Jebusites) before thee, thou shalt smite them and utterly destroy them, thou shalt make no covenant with them, nor show mercy unto them." Moreover we have seen, Deut. XXIII. 19, that the Jew who was forbidden to receive usury from one of his race, might exact it from the foreigner. Now the Jewish world was narrow; they were surrounded by tribes whom the Law bade them abhor and destroy. Hence, taking these to be understood by the name of enemy, the Law itself bade them hate *their enemies*. Of course, the Law contemplated only those tribes who by their idolatry had become hateful to God himself, and it is not wrong to hate what is hateful to God. The object of the Law in establishing this hatred and abomination of the idolatrous tribes in Israel was to preserve Israel from the infection of idolatry. The whole history of the Jews shows how prone they were to adopt the worst superstitions of the surrounding peoples. Hence the Lord says in Exodus, XXIII. 33: "They shall not dwell in thy land, lest they make thee sin against me." The universal charity that we extend to all men, was by the Jew only given to one of his own nation, and this was based on the Law itself. They were commanded to hate the pagan tribes, and the motive of this hatred was the idolatry and crimes of these tribes.

Neither can we say that it is repugnant to our ideas of God that he should command the hatred of man. By the moral conditions of their life, these peoples had forfeited their rights to be considered as men. They were reprobate, and the hatred of Israel for them was founded on their reprobation by God.

"Certo i' piangea, poggiato ad un de' rocchi
 Del duro scoglio, sì che la mia scorta
 Mi disse: Ancor se' tu degli altri sciocchi?
 Qui vive la pietà quando è ben morta.
 Chi è più scellerato di colui
 Che al giudizio divin passion porta?

—Inferno, XX. 25-30.

It would be incompatible with the nature of God to bid a man hate another for a private offense, or to hate a man who had not been reprobated by God. One of the grandest effects of the Incarnation is the universal brotherhood of all men. This is not a mere name. It means the conferring upon man of something which he did not have before, the establishing between man and man of relations which did not exist before. Hence it banished the law of hatred of the foreigner, for now there is no foreigner, the new code is for every nation and every man. Therefore we believe that Christ contrasts his teaching with the teaching of the Law itself, and that he has abolished the distinction between neighbor and stranger, which certainly existed in the Old Law, by extending the lines of the new chosen people to include all the children of Adam.

In opposition to the given interpretation of this sentence, some allege the words of Exodus, XXIII. 4: "If thou meet thine enemy's ox or his ass going astray, thou shalt bring it back to him again. If thou see the ass of him that hateth thee lying under his burden, thou shalt not pass by, thou shalt surely help with him." They allege also the words of Proverbs XXV. 21: "If thine enemy be hungry, give him bread to eat, and if he be thirsty, give him water to drink." These texts are taken by our opponents to prove that the love of the enemy existed in the Old Law.

Now we may remark that, were it thus, the Gospel in this matter would contain nothing more perfect than the Old Law, which would certainly be against the general line of Christ's argument. Hence we believe that both of these passages refer only to the treatment that one Israelite should receive at the hands of another. Enemy, in these passages, does not signify a member of the pagan nations, the hatred of whom was founded on an abhorrence of their idolatry. It signified an Israelite against whom the man was angered for some private cause. It is simply a quaint concrete way of commanding the Israelites to put away hatred for one another, and to extend to one of their race who had injured them the offices of charity in distress. The alleged text of Exodus is cleared up by Deuteronomy, XXII. 1: "Thou shalt not see thy brother's [אֶתְּךָ]

ox or his sheep go astray, and hide thyself from them; thou shalt by all means, bring them again unto thy brother." The Hebrew term here properly means, the collateral kinship. It was extended by the Jew to those of his race, but no farther.

We would not say that the Old Law inculcated the universal hatred of all men not belonging to the chosen people; but to preserve them in the worship of Yahveh, it commanded the hatred of the surrounding tribes. In this respect it was a local temporary law, adapted to the peculiar environment of the Jew. It was not fit to become the universal law of man. Christ substituted for it the universal law of love for every man, by breaking down the distinction between Jew and Gentile, and offering salvation to every man.

The law of Christ could not be given to the world till the mighty change was wrought in the life of man that was effected by the Redemption. Such interpretation of the passage is in harmony with the whole tenor of the discourse, wherein the contrast has uniformly been between the Old Law and the law of Christ; it makes the words of Christ really mean something.

Taking now the full discourse, as it is found in both Evangelists, we find the expression of man's love for man. Here also the words contain both precept and counsel. To love one's enemies by a positive act of love is of precept. That is to say, it is not sufficient to exercise the mere negative act of not wishing evil to our neighbor, but one must exercise the positive act of wishing good to the enemy. This is of precept, and comes directly from the Saviour's words, but the words do not stop here, they go up into the heights.

To treat first of the love of enemy that is of precept, we are led to the following conclusions. One of the chief defects of dealing with enemies is that men regard the enemy *qua talem*, and thus considered, it is impossible to love an enemy. That element in the man which has made the man our enemy exists in our apprehension as an evil thing, and it is metaphysically impossible for evil to be the object of an act of love. Man must rise above the consideration of that element, and regard the man as a creature of God; and then appeal to the love of God existing in one's heart, and aided by God's grace

he can love the enemy. It is thus possible to love an enemy thus considered, even while the propensity of crude nature impels in the opposite direction.

Another defect which hinders the right treatment of enemies is that men endeavor to do for natural motives that which is only possible by supernatural motives. Many lives are supernaturally aimless,—rarely or never moved to action by a supernatural motive. Now the Lord forcibly illustrates the worthlessness of that love that is founded on a mere naturalism. To love one that loves you, and to benefit one that benefits you, are mere natural acts. They are performed by the infidel and the sinner, and are the mere propensity of crude nature. Such acts, done for merely natural motives, entitle a man to no supernatural reward. Of course, the Christian can love even his friends with the right kind of dilection and thereby acquire merit; but the Lord means to say that, when a man restricts the love of neighbor to those naturally lovable, it is a sign that his love is not supernatural, and hence not entitled to the remuneration of supernatural love.

One of the great defects of human conduct is the absence of the supernatural motive. The demon of unbelief has even moved men in our day to despise the supernatural motive of human acts. Some proclaim that it makes man's noblest achievements mercenary, and debases man. This is a wild cry of pride, which is like to the pride of Satan himself. It will never be believed or felt by one who has not substituted self for God as the object of adoration. But Christians who yet hold to the supernatural motive do not appeal to that motive enough. To be able readily to appeal to it, the whole conception of human life must be formed and fashioned by life's supernatural hopes. There must be an ever-conscious realization that the Christian is called to do something more than the ordinary respectable man of society. And yet it is to the shame of Christians that we often find purer and better conduct from people of the world, who found all their actions on mere naturalism, than we find from the so-called followers of Christ. It convinces us sternly of the truth that not they

who enroll their names in the census of the Catholic denomination are Christ's, but they who are moved in all things by Christ's spirit.

Now in the treatment of adversaries, we may be sure that the first impulse that comes to us, after receiving offense or injury, is not founded on the supernatural. It will be the movement of crude nature to pay like for like. The sources of the supernatural are in Heaven, and only available by reflection and the repression of the law of the members. If the soul has been filled with the spirit of Christ's words, their power will assert itself, and the man can rise above nature, and perform the act of forgiveness and love which naturally is impossible; but the sad fact is too often verified that an offense or injury converts a man into an unreflecting being, guided neither by reason nor faith, but only by passion. And the error even prevails among men to consider this hatred of enemies as a sort of grand passion, a sort of indication of greatness of soul, whereas it indicates a narrow, cowardly, weak soul. A magnanimous soul has the moral courage to rise above personal wrongs, and overcome evil by good.

After enunciating the general principle of love of enemies, the Lord specifies some of the most positive ways in which the neighbor may offend us, and he opposes to every one its contrary virtue. It is not the Lord's intent to make a complete enumeration of all the ways in which we may receive wrong from the neighbor, but to illustrate the doctrine by the force of some concrete specifications. Blessing is opposed to cursing, benefits are opposed to hate, and prayer is opposed to insults and persecution. The discourse is made more pointed and forcible by bidding us do good to a man in the very species of acts in which we have suffered evil. The words of the Lord proceed to a climax, for there is no finer or tenderer act of love for a man than to petition Heaven to send its blessings upon him. If a man could only say in truth, I go by these words, I live by these words, then certainly it were well with him. They are plain; every man can understand them, but yet few do them.

The hatred of enemies must not be confounded with a certain antipathy felt for certain individuals whose native

quality and disposition are displeasing. Considering the Lord's words as they contain a precept, one is not obliged *per se* to any acts of special friendship for such a one, provided that in the mind there is the disposition to extend to such person the offices of charity in case of the person's need. The force of the precept only extends to the general acts of good will, but the perfection of doctrine goes higher; it regards not the natural amiability of the subject, but only the love of God, which includes all men.

The Saviour proposes as the model of this charity the infinite perfection of our Father in Heaven. Not that it is in the power of the Christian to equal the perfection of God, but man is advised to make the perfections of God the model of his imitation. In the general providence of the universe, God discriminates not against those who offend Him. He warms them with his sun, and fructifies the seed in their fields by its beneficent heat; he irrigates their fields, and fills their wells with the rain from heaven. And man is bidden to become like to God in attribute and act, that he may be worthy to be called his son. That which is asked is hard, but that which is promised is great, the sonship of God, founded on the likeness of our sanctified being to the high nature of God.

MATT. VI. 1—4.

1. Take heed that ye do not your righteousness before men, to be seen of them: else ye have no reward with your Father who is in Heaven.

2. When therefore thou doest alms, sound not a trumpet before thee, as the hypocrites do in the synagogues and in the streets, that they may have glory of men. Verily I say unto you: They have received their reward.

1. Προσέχετε τὴν δικαιοσύνην ὑμῶν μὴ ποιεῖν ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων πρὸς τὸ θεαθῆναι αὐτοῖς, εἰ δὲ μὴ γε, μισθὸν οὐκ ἔχετε παρὰ τῷ Πατρὶ ὑμῶν· τῷ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

2. Ὅταν οὖν ποιῇς ἑλεημοσύνην μὴ σαλπίσσης ἔμπροσθέν σου, ὥσπερ οἱ ὑποκριταὶ ποιοῦσιν ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς καὶ ἐν ταῖς ρύμαις, ὅπως δοξασθῶσιν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων· ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν· ἀπέχουσιν τὸν μισθὸν αὐτῶν.

3. But when thou doest alms, let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth.

3. Σοῦ δὲ ποιούντος ἑλεημοσύνην μὴ γνῶτω ἡ ἀριστερά σου τί ποιεῖ ἡ δεξιὰ σου.

4. That thine alms may be in secret: and thy Father who seeth in secret shall recompense thee.

4. Ὅπως ᾗ σου ἡ ἐλεημοσύνη ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ καὶ ὁ Πατήρ σου ὁ βλέπων ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ ἀποδώσει σοι.

There is one important variant in the first verse of this text. Where the Vulgate reads *justitiam*, we find in codices E, K, L, M, S, U, Z, Δ, Π, and others the reading *ἐλεημοσύνην*. Tischendorf informs us that in the original text of the Sinaitic Codex there had existed the reading *δικαιοσύνην*, but that later hands had erased it, and corrupted it. *Δικαιοσύνην* is also the reading of the Vatican Codex. The Syriac and Ethiopian texts edited by Walton defend the reading *ἐλεημοσύνην*, and it is followed by the King James' translation, and by the Gothic, Armenian, Persian, and Arabic translations. The Vulgate reading may be regarded as certain. It has the great authority of the Vatican and Sinaitic codices, and is corroborated by the following critical considerations. Had the original text borne the term *ἐλεημοσύνην*, no one would have thought of changing it to the more difficult reading *δικαιοσύνην*. Whereas on the other hand, a difficulty existed in interpreting this latter term. Primarily, it means an abstract virtue or quality of the mind, and as it seemed incongruous to construe it with the *ποιεῖν*, the transcribers rendered the passage easier to their minds by substituting the term *ἐλεημοσύνην*. The Revised Version of Oxford agrees with the Vulgate. The whole incongruity vanishes when we understand by the *δικαιοσύνην* works of righteousness in general, which the Lord afterwards specifies in three classes: alms, prayer, and fasting.

Christ treats first of alms-giving, to which the present passage is devoted. These three works have the highest commendation in Scripture. By prayer we praise and love God; by alms we show mercy and love to the neighbor; and by fasting we subdue the flesh, and exalt the spirit. Hence old Tobias saith: "Prayer with fasting and alms is better than to lay up treasures of gold."

Now the Lord lays down the general canon that if a man do his good works to be seen by men, they have no reward from God. The argument is very simple. The man who proposes in the execution of an act to secure to himself the praises of men, is entitled to only that at which he aims. He receives this, and there his reward stops. He gave nothing to God. Why should he receive aught from God? God will not reward an act that excludes himself. Christ speaks not so much of the sinfulness of such manner of acting, but of its worthlessness. The act is good in itself, and would seem to men to merit the commendation of God; but it is spoiled by the wrong intention which moved it. And in this consists the hypocrisy of the act. Hypocrisy is the simulation of feigning to be what one is not; and the man who performs good works to be seen by men, feigns that he is doing them for God; and in this is the lie, that is hateful to God. As this was the prime vice of the Pharisees, the Lord cites them as an example of it.

The opening word of the passage *προσέχετε*, *take heed*, advises us that the issue needs careful study to preserve the purity of our motives. The desire of human recognition and praise is a stealthy, subtle foe. It flows directly from pride and the disordered love of self, which are deeply rooted in our nature. If we allow ourselves to conduct our lives without self-examination, pride will surely encroach on all our good works, and blight them. It is insidious and deadly, because where it fastens itself the man may vainly believe that he is doing great deeds for God, whereas he is doing nothing. It is so secret that it may be in a man, and he be unconscious of it. A man can only keep it out of his life by that close attention and study which the Lord exhorts, and by thoughtful examination of all man's motives of action. The perfect Christian moves through life in a continual restraint of all the propensities of his nature.

An act may be done principally for virtue's right motive, and have the concomitant motive of the desire of human recognition. In such case, the work is defective, but not totally worthless. It is saved from complete loss, simply because the deadly blight has not infected its whole nature. But it is defective in the measure that the desire to be recog-

nized by men shares in it. Such a work is like an infirm man. He is not dead, nor is he well, but afflicted with a sickness that has a wide range, from slight indisposition even to sickness unto death. Now as a man is not content simply to avoid death, and be exempt from grave disease, but wishes to be well and sound in every member and faculty, so the Christian should not limit himself to save a part of the work for God. He should sedulously purify the work from all dross, and offer the pure gold to God. Oh, the pity of it, to debase the high nature of these works of righteousness, and sell them for the breath and mouth-honor of mortals!

It is not strange that God hates hypocrisy, and that the whole life of Christ is one sublime lesson against hypocrisy's leaven. Hypocrisy is a lie, and a robbery of what belongs to God. Of course, we are speaking of works which in outward seeming and profession of their authors are done for God. Should we wonder that such works are an abomination to God? If a false friend came to us, hiding the thoughts of a false heart under the guise of profuse professions of friendship, if we could penetrate the mask, would not the hollow acts of such a one disgust us? And God, who sees the secrets of all hearts, turns away from such falsity.

There is no evidence that the Jews literally heralded the giving of alms by the sound of trumpets. Hence the second verse is to be taken metaphorically.

In the synagogues, the alms were collected on all Sabbaths, and distributed to the poor in the evening. Besides these there were collectors who went from door to door, collecting food for the poor. The Levitical law also established that the gleanings of the fields, and the grain in the angles of fields should be for the poor. Private charity was also given to the poor in the streets. Now those who affected sanctity of life, in divers ways attracted the observation of men when they gave these alms in synagogues and on the streets. This is what the Lord calls the sounding of a trumpet to attract the attention of men.

The modes and customs of peoples change, but the laws of right and wrong never change. The means of putting ourselves before the notice of men are multiplied now. The press

is a ready trumpet of those who seek the observation of men. Wherefore we know that any charity that seeks the observation and praise of men falls under the judgment of Christ, expressed in this verse. No matter how great is the amount devoted to the alleviation of human want, if the motive be public recognition, such recognition is its only reward. If the intention of the giver be to avoid such publicity, and if public recognition comes unsought, then the recognition avails nothing against the excellence of the work.

There will be times when it will be impossible to avoid observation in the performance of good works, but it will be always in our power to keep our intention right, and to be moved in nothing by the notice that we can not avoid. But even then the perfect Christian will feel a certain regret at being thus known. The act is too sacred to be thus rudely dragged into the vulgar arena. "The violet of charity blooms in hidden nooks, and its charm is inseparable from its secretiveness."

The expression of the Lord in the third verse is figurative. The instrument of giving is usually the right hand. By a figure of speech we may personify the left hand as a witness standing by, and witnessing the deed. Now the Lord would have us so careful to avoid the observation of men in the performance of such a good work as is charity, that the left hand so closely present, if it had eyes, could not behold the deed. The force of language can go no further. It is a beautiful and powerful appeal to us to shun the gaze of men in the performance of our good deeds. The mere withholding from seeking to be known by men is not enough; positive effort must be exerted to hide the good deed. Alms-giving is taken as an example, since it is a work most exposed to this defect of seeking after the recognition of men.

Finally, the Lord declares that these deeds of virtue should be an affair solely between God and the soul. God's recognition, and God's reward should be alone sought. It should be a part of that interior life that the soul lives with God, and thus the work is rendered in a measure worthy to be offered to God, and its reward will not fail. It is a consoling thought to rest on the certainty that all the good that we have done, and which

the world knows not of, and rewards not, is known to God, and rewarded for that special reason that it is unknown to the world. The poor human heart seeks some being in whom to confide such things; it finds the proper being in God.

Instinctively we feel that the longing for human recognition is an alloy in the fine gold of our good works. We feel that our ideal has been lowered; that we have gone backwards, and debased our soul's life. We have accepted the favor of the world for the love of God; The world is too close to us: it requires no striving to realize its presence. But our weak faith does not bring God sufficiently into our realization, that his judgment be all that we long for.

In codices E, K, L, M, S, U, a, b, c, f, g, h, q, in the Peshitto, Gothic, Armenian, Ethiopian, and other versions, in the works of Chrysostom, and some other Fathers, we find at the end of this fourth verse, the terms *ἐν τῷ φανερῷ*, *in aperto*. The King James' version has adopted this reading, rendering the passage: "—and thy Father which seeth in secret, himself shall reward thee openly." In this reading, the sense would be that God would proclaim the hidden deeds of virtue in the glory of the saints. But such addition is not found in **8**, B, D, Z, 1, 22, 108, 209. It is not found in the Syriac of Cureton, nor in the Coptic versions; Cyprian, Jerome, Chromatius, and Augustine rejected it. Augustine testifies that it was not found in many Greek codices which he had seen. The weight of authority is in favor of the Vulgate reading, with which the Revised Version of Oxford agrees.

MATT. VI. 5—15.

5. And when ye pray, ye shall not be as the hypocrites: for they love to stand and pray in the synagogues and in the corners of the streets, that they may be seen of men. Verily I say unto you: They have received their reward.

6. But thou, when thou prayest, enter into thine inner

5. Καὶ ὅταν προσεύχησθε, οὐκ ἔσεσθε ὡς οἱ ὑποκριταί, ὅτι φιλοῦσιν ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς καὶ ἐν ταῖς γωνίαις τῶν πλατειῶν ἑστῶτες προσεύχεσθαι, ὅπως φανῶσιν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις. Ἀμήν λέγω ὑμῖν ἀπέχουσιν τὸν μισθὸν αὐτῶν.

6. Σὺ δὲ ὅταν προσεύχῃ, εἴσελθε εἰς τὸ ταμιεῖόν σου καὶ κλείσας τὴν

chamber, and having shut thy door, pray to thy Father who is in secret, and thy Father who seeth in secret shall recompense thee.

7. And in praying use not vain repetitions, as the Gentiles do: for they think that they shall be heard for their much speaking.

8. Be not therefore like unto them: for your Father knoweth what things ye have need of, before ye ask him.

9. After this manner therefore pray ye: Our Father who art in Heaven, Hallowed be thy name.

10. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done, as in Heaven, so on earth.

11. Give us this day our daily bread.

12. And forgive us our debts, as we also have forgiven our debtors.

13. And bring us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil.

14. For if ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you.

15. But if ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses.

θύραν σου πρόσευξαι τῷ Πατρὶ σου τῷ ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ, καὶ ὁ Πατὴρ σου ὁ βλέπων ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ ἀποδώσει σοι.

7. Προσευχόμενοι δὲ μὴ βατταλογήσητε ὥσπερ οἱ ὑποκριταί, δοκοῦσιν γὰρ ὅτι ἐν τῇ πολυλογίᾳ αὐτῶν εἰσακουσθήσονται.

8. Μὴ οὖν ὁμοιωθῆτε αὐτοῖς, οἶδεν γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς ὁ Πατὴρ ὑμῶν, ὧν χρεῖαν ἔχετε, πρὸ τοῦ ὑμᾶς αἰτῆσαι αὐτόν.

9. Οὕτως οὖν προσεύχεσθε ὑμεῖς: Πάτερ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, ἁγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου.

10. Ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου, γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς.

11. Τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δὸς ἡμῖν σήμερον.

12. Καὶ ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰ ὀφειλήματα ἡμῶν ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφήκαμεν τοῖς ὀφειλέταις ἡμῶν.

13. Καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν, ἀλλὰ ρῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ.

14. Ἐὰν γὰρ ἀφήτε τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν, ἀφήσει καὶ ὑμῖν ὁ Πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος.

15. Ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ἀφήτε τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν οὐδὲ ὁ Πατὴρ ὑμῶν ἀφήσει τὰ παραπτώματα ὑμῶν.

In the fifth verse, codices **ℵ**, B, Z, 1, 22, 118 exhibit the plural form of the verb, *προσεύχησθε*. Our Vulgate follows this reading, and the Old Italian, Gothic, Sahidic, Bohairic, Ethiopian, Armenian and Oxford versions support it. This reading is endorsed by Origen, Chrysostom and Augustine, by Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort, and is practically certain. The singular form *προσεύχη* is found in D, E, K, L, M, S, U, Δ, Π, and some others, and is supported by the Peshitto and Cureton's Syriac. This reading is followed by the King James' version. The authorities which support the addition *ἐν τῷ φανερώ* in the fourth verse, support it also in the sixth verse.

In the twelfth verse, the codices **ℵ**, B, Z, exhibit the first aorist form of the verb *ἀφίημι*, *ἀφήκαμεν*. Origen, Gregory of Nyssa, and Basil support this reading, and it is by far the more probable one.

The most important variant has place in the thirteenth verse. After the petition for deliverance from evil, a certain doxology is added in many authorities. This additamentum is as follows in Greek: *"Ὅτι σοῦ ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία καὶ ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας ἀμήν*. The King James' translation is built upon this reading, and renders the passage: "For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory forever. Amen." It is a curious fact that the Vulgate retains the sole Amen, and rejects the rest. This additamentum is found in codices E, G, K, L, M, S, U, V, Δ, Π. It is found in codices f, g, q of the Vetus Itala, in all the Syriac versions, and in the Ethiopian, Armenian and Gothic versions. It is also endorsed by Chrysostom and some other Fathers. Nevertheless it is certain that the entire passage including the Amen is spurious. The whole passage including the Amen is rejected by Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort. It is omitted in codices **ℵ**, B, D, Z, and several of the minuscule codices. In several minuscule codices, we find the reading on the margin, or written in red, to denote that it was a mere liturgical response. Scholia are also found in several codices to the effect that the passage was not found in other codices. It is not found in codices, a, b, c, ff¹, g², l, of the Vetus Itala. It is not found in the Coptic version, and the

revised protestant version rejects it. It is not found in the works of Origen, Cyprian, Maximus, Cæsarius, Tertullian, Hilary, Chromatius, Juvenius, and Augustine.

The reading originated in the liturgical use that was made of this passage in the early Church. This is attested by the testimonies of Cæsarius and Euthymius, and it is rendered more probable by the existence of other like examples. The spirit of the words differentiates them from the speech of Christ, and gives to them a distinctively liturgical character.

At the end of the fourteenth verse, the *τὰ παραπτώματα ὑμῶν*, which forms the basis of the *delicta vestra* of the Vulgate has but very slight authority, and can not be considered a probable reading. At the end of the conditional clause in the fifteenth verse, the words *τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν* are inserted in codices B, E, G, K, L, M, S, U, V, Δ, Π. They are also found in some codices of the Vetus Itala, in Cureton's Syriac, and in the Sahidic, Bohairic and Gothic. Tischendorf rejects them on the authority of *Σ*, D, 1, 118, 209, codices a, c, ff¹, g¹, h, k, l, the Peshitto, and St. Augustine. But these latter variants are of slight importance, since the sense demands that the words be expressed or understood in both cases.

Coming now to the exposition of the text, we find that the Lord, in the first two verses, condemns ostentation in prayer. He applies to the act of prayer the same doctrine that he had laid down for alms. This ostentation in prayer was more characteristic of that age than of ours. The honor of the people was obtained in those days by attention to the outward forms of religion, and men will always be drawn by that which brings them honor or profit. The defect of our time is rather that men are now ashamed to have any man see them pray.

At morning and evening the Jews recited three passages taken from the Law. The first was from Deuteronomy, VI. 4-9. The second was from Deuteronomy, XI. 13-21; and the third was from Numbers, XV. 37-41. From the opening word in Deuteronomy, VI. 4, *שמע*, "hear," this office of devotion was called the *Shema*. In the morning they recited two prayers before the *Shema* and one after it. In the evening, they recited two prayers before the *Shema* and two after it.

Thus the whole number of the prayers was the mystic number seven. Although strictly the passages from the Law were the *Shema*, usage prevailed to speak sometimes of those and the prayers collectively as the *Shema*. The strictest observation is exacted by the Mishna in the recital of the *Shema*. A workman might recite the *Shema* on a scaffold or on the wall. A man seated upon a beast was obliged to descend if possible; otherwise he was to turn his face towards the holy city, and recite it with composure of mind. While reciting the *Shema* a man might not interrupt it by a salutation, except in case of a personage entitled to great honor, or in case of salutation of a man who was feared.

But besides the *Shema*, there was a complex series of other prayers for eating and drinking and for the various events of the day.

Now all these prayers were, in the case of the Pharisees, vitiated by hollow hypocritical outward formalism. Hence they affected to pray long prayers in the synagogues and in the open places where the streets crossed, and where a multitude would be gathered from the various streets.

The usual attitude in prayer was to stand. Of itself the attitude of standing to pray would not be reprehensible. But the Pharisees took this attitude for the end to make themselves conspicuous to the public gaze, and receive the favor of the populace. If a man moved about through the public way with recollected mind in prayer, he would escape observation. But when one was seen to stand immovable, with face turned towards the temple, the people knew that the man was praying, and he received in consequence a great respect from all.

The Talmud records such prayers. The Jerusalem Talmud has the following: "I observed the Rabbi Jannai, standing and praying in the street of Trippor, and repeating an additional prayer at each of the four corners." There was no interior religion in these hypocrites. In them religion never penetrated to the inner nature of man.

Now hypocrisy does not take that particular form in our days, but it is by no means banished from the earth. Too many are very willing that their good deeds be known and applauded by men. Very few there are who study to keep all

the good deeds which they may accomplish in secret. It is not in the fact that men see the good work that the defect lies; the good work fails when the motive is that it might be seen by men. There is more of this poison in us than we know. It may not be made a means of cloaking moral rottenness in us, as was the case in the Pharisees, but it is always base, and false, and hateful to God.

The Lord opposes to the Pharisaic method of prayer the Christian's rule. By these words the Saviour does not condemn public prayer. The nature of man and his relations to his Creator demand public prayer. In the Acts of the Apostles and other documents, we find that public prayer was a great feature of early Christian life. Here then we are to take the spirit of the words. In a simple concrete form the Lord declares that in prayer we are to shut out the world, and let our spirit commune with a spiritual God. It is only when religious belief and practice is thus spiritualized that it becomes alive. The conditions favorable to prayer are seclusion from the world, and the intention of adoring God. To repair to the seclusion of one's inner chamber for the purpose of adoring God manifests a right disposition of mind. The Saviour's words lead us to this disposition of mind, and then we are to carry it into effect in all our acts of worship. The place is nothing, but the disposition of mind must be the formal element of all prayer, whether public or private. The Lord's words primarily bid us shut out the world's recognition of the good work, but the spirit of his teaching may rightly be extended to the shutting out of the distractions of the world also.

The great mercy and condescension of God is made evident in the sixth verse. Man should consider it a mercy that he is allowed to speak to God, and present to him his petitions. And yet the words of Christ make God the debtor, and declare prompt payment to the petitioner. These words, by the inducement of the divine promise, draw us into the inner spiritual world, wherein the soul develops its high powers, and lives its proper life with God.

Prayer is a speaking to God, and in order to be a rational act the mind must direct itself to God, and recollect itself in him. Now although God is everywhere and in all things, we

become not conscious of his being except by spiritual recollection. The lips may utter the name of God in the formulas of prayer, and address to him words, but if the inmost soul is not in the act, there is no prayer. This spiritual power of man's soul often lies dormant, and becomes enfeebled by long disuse. The habits of a man's thoughts shape his character. When the soul fastens itself to the things of time, the spiritual world grows continually fainter. God becomes an unknown God. Being rapt in worldly studies, we grow strangers to God. God receives no thought, no soul-worship. It seems that a great part of the prayers of men is worthless, because they never have developed their spiritual life. Men move along in a routine, and do the pleasant things of religion, but the energy of their being and the intensity of their thoughts are given to the world. Weakness of faith is the real cause of such spiritual failures.

The seventh verse is aimed against a false and superstitious conception of the Deity, which does not now prevail in the Christian world. The heathen worshippers believed that they could move their gods by eloquence, and by a prolix and able presentation of their claims. Christ characterizes their mode of prayer as *τὸ βαττολογεῖν*. The word is not found in classic authors, and it is difficult to determine its precise signification. It has been rendered "to use vain repetitions," but such sense seems to be too restricted. Some derive it from a certain stammerer named Battus in Herodotus IV. 155. Others believe it to have originated from the poet Bathus, mentioned by Suidas, who composed long, stupid and tautological hymns. It is far more probable that the term originated *κατὰ μίμησιν τῆς φωνῆς*, meaning primarily to stammer, and from this came the derived meaning to talk much to no purpose. Hence we believe the sense predicated here by the Lord to be a futile, inane verbosity in prayer.

Commentators find a specimen of this *βαττολογεῖν* in the prayer of the priests of Baal, I [III.] Kings, XVIII. 26: "And they took the bullock which was given them, and they dressed it, and called on the name of Baal from morning even until noon saying: O, Baal, hear us. But there was no voice, nor any that answered. And they leaped upon the altar that was

made. And it came to pass at noon, that Eliah mocked them, and said: Cry aloud, for he is a god, either he is talking, or he is hunting, or he is in a journey, or peradventure he sleepeth, and must be awaked. And they cried aloud, and cut themselves after their manner, with knives and lancets till the blood gushed upon them."

The error of this mode of worship was that it mistook the nature of God. God knows the secrets of the heart, and there is no need of this stress, as though he were a being that must be drawn away from his occupations or amusements by the persistence of studied forms of expression. Moreover, this Gentile method of worship placed the moving power of prayer in the eloquence and persistence of the appeal. It supposed that knowledge could be given to the Deity which he did not possess before, and that he could be moved as a mutable being. This is illustrated by the passage in Terence, *Heaut.* VI. 6:

"Ohe! jam desine deos, uxor, gratulando obtundere,
Tuam esse inventam gnatam; nisi illos tuo ex ingenio judicas,
Ut nil credas intelligere, nisi idem dictum est centies."

Now the Lord reproves not insistence in prayer. His example and words exhort us to pray always. Neither does he condemn repetitions of the same prayer. On the night of his capture, he prayed three times, repeating the same prayer.—*Matt.* XXVI. 44. But what Christ condemns is the placing of the value of the prayer in the prolixity of the words. What God desires in prayer is not to be informed of anything; he knows all things. What he desires is the faith, and love, and trust of the heart; and words are only valuable as expressions of these inner creations. In fact, he has no need of words at all, but they have place in man's worship, inasmuch as they help the nature of man to give to God the worship of the heart. Christian worship therefore possesses its power not in the material words, but in the acts of the mind and heart which God knows independently of the words by which they are expressed. We are not therefore to teach God anything, but we are to bend all the energies of our nature to move an omniscient Being to have mercy on us, to love us, and to give us the necessary graces.

The power of a prayer is not measured by the number or beauty of the words, but by the interior acts of the soul, of which it is an expression. God cannot be persuaded by the force of words, or the skill of logic to do a thing, but he can be moved by the interior acts of the soul. The Gentile places the power of the prayer in the force of the words themselves; Christ bids us place it in the fervor of the faith and love of the soul.

But why should God, who knows our needs, wish to be petitioned by us? Not to be taught by us, or persuaded by us, but to receive the testimony of our faith, hope, and love. In prayer and petition to God, our nature fulfills the proper end for which it was created. It is true, God knows our thoughts and affections before we utter them, but the very utterance is a worshipful act, and pleasing to God. Prayer and petition may be sent up to Heaven by thoughts without words, but never by words without thoughts.

Having put down the vain Gentile method of prayer, the Lord propounds the grand norm and pattern of all prayer. The Lord's prayer fulfills a twofold function for us. It is in itself a complete and perfect prayer, the best of all prayers, and has in itself an intrinsic power which no words of human composition can ever have. The Lord bade us pray thus, and we are perfectly obedient when we respect his own divine words. It is also a norm and exemplar according to which all our prayers ought to be framed. The Lord never willed that this should be the sole formula of prayer. He himself prayed different forms of prayer. But he willed that this should be the grand norm of prayer, and establish the lines upon which all prayer should proceed. There is in it no ostentatious rhetoric, no *βαττολογία*, but a heavenly simplicity and religious calm.

Many theologians analyze the Lord's Prayer into the opening invocation and seven petitions. The invocation is plain: "Our Father, who art in Heaven." The petitions follow in this order: 1. "Hallowed be thy name." 2. "Thy Kingdom come." 3. "Thy will be done on earth as it is in Heaven." 4. "Give us this day our daily bread." 5. "And forgive us our trespasses, as we have forgiven them that trespass against us." 6. "And lead us not into temptation," 7. "But deliver us from evil."

The first three members are not properly petitions. They are more properly acts of adoration of God.

It is to be noticed that the Heavenly Father is called *Our Father*, and that the form of expression is in the plural number of the first person throughout. Christ in addressing the Father in his own personal communications with him, speaks of him as *My Father*. The singular personal pronoun betokens the incommunicable sonship of Christ by the act of generation. But our sonship comes to us not by nature, but through the Incarnation and Redemption. It is not natural: it is an ineffable adoptive sonship. Now by this sonship all men are brothers, and the Lord teaches us by the very form of expression to associate our fellow men in our prayers and petitions to Heaven. Through Christ the faithful are all incorporated into one body, and this model prayer teaches us that we should consider ourselves members of a common body. At the outset, Christ teaches us that we are to make our prayers to God as our Father.

One of the effects of the Redemption is the bringing into prominence of the motive of God as a Father. Through Christ we acquire a relation to God which justifies this term. God was sometimes called Father in the Old Law. Thus Isaiah says: "Verily, thou art our Father, though Abraham knoweth us not, and Israel acknowledge us not: thou, O Lord, art our Father, our Redeemer; thy name is from everlasting."—Is. LXIII. 16. And again: "But now, O Lord, thou art our Father; we are the clay, and thou our potter; and we all are the work of thy hand."—Is. LXIV. 8. But these are prophetic utterances placed in the mouth of the Church that was to be, and they only predict the future relation. In Deuteronomy, XXXIII. 6, Moses declares unto Israel that Yahveh has been to them a Father. But such fatherhood was only a type of the perfect fatherhood through Christ. The people of old were never taught to address the God of Heaven by the loving name of Father. Neither is this relation founded only on the act of creation and conservation, but more properly on regeneration through Christ. Hence St. John declares: "But as many as received him, to them he gave the right to become children, even to them who believe in his name."—John I. 12.

The Old Law was the law of fear, and the Most High kept before Israel the attributes of his power. They knew him as Lord. The New Law is the law of love, and while we recognize God's power, we draw closer to him, and call him our Father. Thus it is written in the Epistle to Romans, VIII. 15: "For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry Abba, Father." The very term Father, applied to God, carries in it a great truth. It brings him closer to us than any other term. It imports that we have for God that tender childlike love and trust, which he prizes more than aught else in man. There is no love so unselfish, no love so enduring, no love so ingenuous as the parent's love. By the laws of analogy this natural bond is taken to illustrate the blessed relation in which God stands to man, whom he loves. The clause "who art in Heaven," is not to be understood as if God's infinite essence were included, or his presence circumscribed and confined in a definite place, for he fills Heaven and earth, and the immensity of the universe. But he is said to be in Heaven, because there is the special manifestation of his presence and his power and glory. Heaven imports a state of being in which God reigns supreme; in which no evil is found; in which God's elect angels and saints are raised to their most perfect state of being, and enjoy the presence of God face to face. Hence Aristotle says that the persuasion is innate in all peoples that the Deity is in Heaven. Moreover, by the mention of God's throne we are impressed by the high nature of God, and moved thereby to reverence; and we are moved also to raise the goal of our hopes above the perishing earth, and place it with God.

The appellation "Father" which Christ taught us to address to God is a message of God's great love of us. The love of God likens itself to a father's love to show its providence, its mercy, its ever-watchful care, its secure protection. That tender name banishes all cold reserve between God and man. As the child looks to the parent for everything, so should we look to receive all from God. In the father's protection the child rests secure, and infinitely more should we confide in God's almighty care. As the father's love moves him to instruct and discipline the child, so God in mercy chastens us

that we may be more worthy of love, and more capable of happiness. It is not that God loves us less that he allows us to drink the cup of sorrow, but because by the cross man mounts to a higher grade of being, and refines his soul from baser dross. What an incomprehensible mystery that God should offer man the exalted dignity of sonship? Sad and awful is the reflection that man thus raised to sonship of God, does like Esau, despise his birthright for the mean things of earth. God's love of man is reflected in the heavens and in the earth. God's love of man brought the material universe into being. The sun, the moon and the stars send down upon the earth the smile of God's love. The myriad forms of life on earth, the beneficent course of seasons, the fecundity and beauty of nature, all are effects of God's everlasting love. God's love is the cause of creation, of Redemption, and of grace. "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have eternal life."—John III. 16. And in the midst of this immensity of God's love ungrateful man stands cold and ungrateful; and turns from God to God's enemy sin.

Many believe that the first person of the Blessed Trinity is signified here by the name of Father. It seems far more probable that the name regards the Deity as one in substance, and threefold in person. The fatherhood of God is founded in a relation to man which regards the three persons, and the perfect form of prayer must include the Trinity.

In the sentence: "Hallowed be thy name," the term "name" signifies the essence of God himself as manifested to us, and apprehended by our thoughts and words, and it is the medium by which we think or speak of a thing. It is the ideal representation of a thing. The name of a thing embodies a notion or conception of the thing, fixes such conception, and makes it subject to record and recall for common use in the processes and interchange of thought. Hence the mind, while using the name as representing the thing, properly centers its conceptions in the thing itself.

The true sense of *ἀγαζεν* in this context, as given by Schleusner, is *pie et sancte aliquem colere et venerari*.

By the declaration, "Hallowed be thy name" we express the soul's intent to give proper glory and honor to God, and we pray that God may be thus honored by all his creatures. We contemplate therein the perfect idea of God's worship which we wish to render to him, and wish that all men may likewise render him.

The glory of God is the object of creation, the end of the universe. Hence this properly occupies the first place in the prayer. The object of that member is not to petition God to effect this result. In truth, it is not a petition at all. It is rather a profession that the first object of our thoughts, desires, and purposes is the honor and glory of God. It proclaims at once that we wish this as the first thing in life; and this wish has a grand directing influence in all the ends we aim at. Moreover, it declares that by positive effort in our own lives, in our thoughts, our words, and our deeds, we shall give to God his due worship, and promote his honor and glory in all things.

In the second member there is some divergency of opinion regarding the precise sense of "thy kingdom." God has absolute dominion over all creatures of the universe, and in this sense, his reign is capable of no amplification. But God has another kingdom in relation to man, and it is of this that these words treat. Some believe that thereby is meant the spiritual reign of God in our souls by grace. For this opinion Cajetan is cited. Lamy interprets the term of the Church of Christ. Several Fathers and commentators apply the words to the second advent of Christ; while others refer them to the Beatific Vision. It seems that all these opinions take a narrow view of the issue. They fix the mind on what is only a part of the entity called here the kingdom of Heaven. The kingdom of Heaven here means the union of man with God. By praying that it may come, we express a desire that it may be amplified, and enroll ever and ever more of the sons of men in its organization. It includes all those realities mentioned in the afore-said opinions and more. It has various elements and stages of existence. Its members on earth are all who are regenerated through Christ. Its consummation shall consist when all the

elect shall be gathered in to the beatific reign of God. It comprises every force of righteousness that makes for God,—faith, and love, and grace, and good works.

In praying that this kingdom may come, we pray for the dilatation of its various elements in ways fitting to their natures. Such a proposition contemplates the growth and diffusion of those righteous forces that put down evil, and win souls to God. The establishment of that great kingdom is the end of the creation of man. It is the end of the Incarnation; in fact, it is the end of all that God has done and does for man.

Such a vital interest should hold a chief place in our desires and deeds. To build up that kingdom, and increase its membership, should be a leading purpose in our lives. By this member we unite our desires with the great design of God, and we offer him the forces of our nature to promote that great end. By this member we open up our souls to the action of God, and we entreat an increase in those elements which constitute the reign of God in our souls. We show an interest in the things that are dear to God.

Now that kingdom is amplified every time evil is dethroned in a human soul, and the reign of righteousness is established there. It is amplified by the spread of faith through the world. The man who brings a man nearer to Christ in any way acts in the spirit of these words. The Jews looked for the coming of a kingdom which accorded with their carnal views. Christ teaches his followers to look for a kingdom of a wondrous spiritual nature, vast and eternal. That vast kingdom will finally totally consist in Heaven. It now exists in Heaven, in Purgatory, and on earth. The kingdom of Heaven has come into all the souls of the elect who are now with God. These belong permanently to God, and are confirmed in grace so that their state can not change.

The kingdom of God has also come into every soul who has departed this life in peace with God, even though that soul be still detained in a state of purgation. These souls also are confirmed to God so that they can never be lost to God's kingdom. They have not come to the Beatific Vision, but they have passed into such a blessed state that they can never turn away from God.

The kingdom of Heaven has come into every soul on earth that is in a state of grace. This number continually varies. By sin some leave it; by conversion from sin and by faith in God others are added. It is especially to this part of the kingdom that the petition applies. By it we pray that this number be augmented. We pray that men may come to a saving knowledge of salvation through Christ; that men may abandon sin and turn to God; and that the number of the elect may grow greater through faith, love, and grace.

This petition fills the heroic missionaries with zeal and courage to give their lives for the salvation of souls. It is the first principle in all apostolic zeal.

In the part of that kingdom that is now in Heaven the reign of God is marred by no disturbing agency of evil. The will of God there holds perfect sway, and all the angels and blessed elect move in love to execute that will. Of course, they find not the impediments of corrupt nature in this perfect execution, for they have put on incorruption. Therefore God's will moves Heaven not by constraint, but those higher intelligences find their blessedness in doing that which God wills. Neither does the doing of that will in Heaven entail trial, renunciation, and suffering; for they have passed above these. But the part of the kingdom yet on earth offers an obedience which makes its norm of imitation the perfect doing of the will of God as it is done in Heaven.

There is a will of God ruling in the world which theologians call the absolute will of God, or the *voluntas beneplaciti*. This is in nowise dependent on second causes, and hence it always has its fulfilment. Of this the Psalmist declares: "But our God is in the Heavens; he hath done whatsoever he hath pleased."—Ps. CXV. 3. [Vulg. CXIII. 3.] And Isaiah saith: "My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure." Now the creature can not alter this will, but his attitude towards it should be that of perfect accord and joyous acquiescence. There is another respect of the will of God toward man which theologians denominate the preceptive will, or the *voluntas signi*. By this will God wishes certain things to be done through the co-operation of man's free will. This will may be thwarted by man's voluntary disobedience. Now it is of this

will that the present member of the Lord's prayer chiefly treats. Hence, in this member of the prayer, we place our wills in perfect accord with the will of God. We also profess that we wish that God's will may be obeyed on earth after the manner that it is in Heaven. Of course, human nature, in its earthly period, will never attain to a perfect equality in obedience with the celestial beings, but the manner in which the angels and saints in Heaven obey should be the model of our imitation.

The first application of the prayer is in our own lives. The fact that we long to see God's will obeyed on earth shows a rectitude of heart and a love of God that are eminently pleasing to him. The perfect fulfilment of this profession demands unquestioning obedience. God's ways are not our ways, and he assigns no causes for his mysterious ways. It is not for us to question why God wills anything; but being assured that it is the will of God, that should be the motive of perfect obedience. And we should move to do the will of God not with sorrow and reluctance, but gladly and eagerly. It is easy to do the will of God; when it is in accord with our natural inclinations. But when it calls to renunciation, and to trial, and to suffering, perfect obedience is rarely found.

These words are often on the lips of every Christian; their profession is to make the life of the pilgrim Christian a counterpart of the life of the angels and blessed in Heaven. And yet, in daily life we see few concerned in accomplishing the perfect will of God. The words become for many a mere form, whose real meaning they have never seized. Even some of those who do advert to their sense, conceive them as a general reflection on the world, whereas their primary accomplishment should be the dedication of our own personal wills to God, to render to him an obedience that shall stop at nothing. Jesus Christ set us an example of the perfect fulfilment of these words, when in the shadow of the cross, he prayed: "Father, if thou be willing remove this cup from me: nevertheless, not my will but thine be done."—Luke, XXII. 42.

In all holy men we find this resignation to the will of God. The highest manifestation was found in the life of Christ. To do the Father's will was the supreme motive which shaped his whole life: "For I am come down from Heaven, not to do

my own will, but the will of him that sent me.”—John VI. 38.

Like to this was the mind of the Mother of God when she declared: “Behold the handmaid of the Lord; be it unto me according to thy word.” Christ declares: “For whosoever shall do the will of my Father, who is in Heaven, he is my brother and sister and mother.”—Matt. XII. 50.

Every man should seek but one thing in life, the will of God. All that is contrary to the will of God is evil; all that is according to the will of God is good, absolutely good. The will of God is merciful, loving, informed by infinite wisdom. In its workings infinite wisdom and infinite love combine to lead a man ever upwards to a higher and happier state of being. The will of God is mysterious; it may lead a man through the path of sorrow and pain; but the certain knowledge that all this suffering is but the means that infinite love must use to prepare man for eternal happiness should make of suffering itself a delight. When a man gives himself totally to do the will of God, he enters on the secure path of holiness. If he persist in that holy determination, and put his resolution into act, he must become one of the saints of God. God may try him in order to perfect him; but God has sufficiently revealed himself to merit an absolute trust in the midst of the darkest night of human sorrow.

After having rendered to God fitting worship, and having placed the will and the forces of our nature in perfect accord with the divine will, the prayer proceeds to direct petitions to God for the necessities of body and soul. The first petition is for bread.

A celebrated question has arisen here regarding the designation of this bread. The Lord's prayer, in a slightly more compendious form, is found again in Luke XI. 3. In both texts the bread is designated as *ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ἐπιούσιος*. The term *ἐπιούσιος* is rendered in the Vulgate translation of St. Matthew *supersubstantialis*; while the same term occurring in Luke XI. 3, is by the Vulgate rendered *quotidianus*. The term *supersubstantialis* in Matthew's text is the work of St. Jerome. The Rheims-Douay edition, which follows the Vulgate in everything, translates the term in Matthew by *supersubstantial*, in

Luke by *daily*. The protestant versions render the form uniformly *daily*, though the Revised Edition prints as a marginal reading: "bread for the coming day." The term *daily* prevails in the popular form of the prayer in the English tongue.

That the word *daily* has place in the sentence is evidenced by the text of Luke, wherein the phrase τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν, *day by day*, is added over and above the ἐπιούσιος. Hence, while admitting that the sense of the words is a petition for daily bread, we proceed to examine what is the real sense of the term ἐπιούσιος.

Concerning the sense of this term, Jerome is not consistent. In his Commentary on the Epistle to Titus, he emphatically denies that the words signify material bread; "Far be it from us, who are commanded to take no thought for the morrow, to believe that we are bidden to ask in the Lord's prayer for that bread which is in a brief time digested, and is cast out into the privy." He interprets it of the Lord, who calls himself the bread of life. Ambrose and some other authorities have also supported this view. That such opinion is false, rests on convincing data. It is a canon of Scriptural exegesis to adhere to the literal sense, unless a grave and evident reason moves us to abandon it. Now here, though the context and the words themselves persuade us to accept the plain literal sense, this opinion departs from it, and brings in one of the boldest of metaphors. Moreover, if such were the sense, it would be absurd to represent it by the σήμερον of Matthew and the τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν as a daily necessity. Finally, according to that opinion, in the model of prayer, which should be simple and adapted to the intelligence of the humblest mind, the Lord would have introduced a figure out of keeping with its context, and unintelligible to the average mind.

Of course, by a pious accommodation the sense can be extended to include spiritual graces and blessings, but it seems evident that such was not the sense of the Lord in formulating the petition. The words are interpreted of material bread, designed to sustain the body, by Chrysostom, Gregory of Nyssa, Basil, Theophylactus, Euthymius, Tostatus, Maldonatus, Toleti, Calmet, Knabenbauer, and by nearly all modern interpreters.

Cajetan objected against such exposition of the words that it places the needs of the body before those of the soul. This is false, since in the three preceding members, the soul's interests are saved. There the soul gives homage to God, and sets itself in right relations to him, and in the member, "thy kingdom come," in its broad comprehensive sense, the graces of God are asked to come into our souls. Moreover, even were it as they represent, the defense of Maldonatus would save us: "Respondeo Christum non tam ordinem dignitatis rerum quam naturæ et infirmitatis nostræ sequi voluisse: natura prius vult vivere, deinde bene vivere." By this prayer Christ also consults the soul's interest, inasmuch as he tempers the desire of getting, limiting it to the daily necessities, which man thereby recognizes as coming to him from the bounty of God.

It is well known that in Scriptural usage bread is taken to signify the body's food of whatever nature. Thus in Genesis, III. 19: "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat *bread* till thou return unto the ground—." Again in Genesis, XXXIX. 6: "And he left all that he had in Joseph's hand, and he knew not aught he had, save the *bread* which he did eat." Hence it is clear that the petition is for the body's daily sustenance of food.

To speak now of those who hold positive opinions on the ἐπιούσιος, we find two leading opinions. Some derive the term from ἔπειμι, *to come upon, to come after, to succeed*. The compound is made up of ἐπί and ἔιμι, *to come or go*. Now we find the present participle of this verb joined to ἡμέρα used to signify the morrow. Thus it is used in Acts, VII. 26: "And the next day [Τῇ τε ἐπιούσῃ ἡμέρᾳ] he showed himself unto them as they strove, etc." The advocates of the first opinion derive the sense of ἐπιούσιος from the sense of the participle in the passage in the Acts, and interpret it to mean food for the morrow, so that the petition would be: "Give us this day our bread for the morrow." Interpreted thus, this petition would cut off all excessive solicitude for the future necessities of life, and would place the soul's trust in the Providence of God for the needs of the coming day. St. Jerome declared that he had found the term rendered in the Nazarene Gospel by מחר^{מחר} which corresponds to the *crastinus* of the Latin. Knabenbauer

defends this sense, and he cites in support of it the Bohairic and Sahidic versions. It is also defended by Rosenmüller.

In designating the morrow as *ἡ ἐπιούσα ἡμέρα* the literal sense is the *coming* day. This is perfectly congruous as applied to the day, for the day is conceived as an entity which comes in the inevitable course of time. But in order to show the impossibility of thus qualifying our daily sustenance, we need only give to the terms their true sense. Who would say: "Give us this day our *coming* bread?"

The participle *ἐπιούσα* does not in the former enunciation lose its basic meaning of coming: it can only be interpreted as *the morrow* by the understanding of *ἡμέρα*, that is, the *coming* day. Now in order to get the sense of "for the morrow" from *ἐπιούσιος* we must consider it an adjective derived from *ἐπιούσα*. This seems contrary to the laws of language, and precedents are not found to warrant it.

Another opinion derives the term from *ἐπί* and *οὐσία*, *substance*. Theophylactus has explained it accurately to be *ἄρτος ἐπὶ τῇ οὐσίᾳ καὶ συστάσει ἡμῶν αὐτάρκης*, *the bread which is sufficient for our maintenance and support*. Thus it corresponds to the prayer of Agur, Proverbs XXX. 8: "—feed me with food that is needful for me [*τὰ δέοντα καὶ τὰ αὐτάρκης*]." Hence we believe that the *ἄρτος ἐπιούσιος* is *victus substantia, seu victus vitæ nostræ sustentandæ et alendæ sufficiens ac necessarius*. The analogy of the Greek tongue justifies this etymology. Thus we have *ἐπιλήμιος* from *ἐπί* and *ληνός*, relating to a wine-vat or the vintage; *ἐπιτάφιος* from *ἐπί* and *τάφος* relating to a tomb.

Objection has been made that in the composition of *ἐπί* and *οὐσία* the *ι* would be elided, so that the form would result in *ἐπούσιος*. But we have evidences in classical Greek that this does not always occur. Thus we have *ἐπιεικής*, *ἐπιήρανος*, *ἐπίορκος*, *ἐπίουρος* and others.

Now, in adopting this opinion, we need in nowise change the wording of the Lord's Prayer. The terms daily bread mean directly that which we here defend to be the sense of *ἄρτος ἐπιούσιος*, namely the necessary food day by day for the maintenance of the body. The prayer is simple, yet sublime. It asks not for wealth or luxuries, but for the substance

necessary to support life. It brings the Providence of God intimately into our daily lives. It recognizes all as coming from God, and tempers the solicitude for the things of the body by a benign trust in God. It is exactly in line with that other declaration of the Saviour, where he bids them be not solicitous for what they should eat. It accords with the admonition of St. Paul to Timothy I. VI. 8: "And having food and raiment, let us therewith be content." It is a grand act of religion to recognize every day man's dependence on God for the fruits of the earth. The fact that a man has the substance of this world does not render this prayer less apposite. By it man recognizes God as the giver of that which he possesses; he prays for a continuance of God's blessings; and he establishes the right relation between himself and the goods of the earth. They are not in man's absolute dominion, that he may foster his pride therein, but they are gifts of God, and man's hold on them is simply to satisfy the necessities of the body.

The next petition has reference to the maintenance of the soul's life. One of the necessary conditions of the supernatural life of the soul is God's forgiveness of sin. This need is universal; all men are sinners, and need the mercy of God. Hence in the model of all man's prayers, there is placed the petition for this great need of man. Sin is called a debt, *ὀφείλημα*, whereby we are brought to a realization of the real nature of sin. That by *ὀφειλήματα* the Lord means sins, is evident from the text itself and from the parallel passage of Luke XI. 4, where the term *ἁμαρτίαι* is used.

By the fact of creation and by God's subsequent benefits, man owes to God obedience, service, worship and love. This is a positive obligation, the first of all obligations. By sin man breaks that contract, and becomes a bankrupt before God. That debt he alone can never pay. It must be forgiven him, and is forgiven him through Christ. God could forgive him without any payment, but God has not willed to do so. It is one of the mysterious ways of God to exact payment of that obligation, and this payment has been made, and is made by the merits of Christ. The system seems strange to the world, but it is God's way. We could not pay the obligation, and we have not paid it. Our justification is free as relates to us, but

as relates to Christ, it was obtained by full payment. Now all that we can do is to dispose our souls by the aid of the free grace of God, and ask the forgiveness which we need. And this member of the prayer frames the petition. It brings also before man's mind the consciousness that he is a sinner standing in need of daily forgiveness. The very forms of expression of the prayer suppose its daily recital. It is designed for the sanctification of every day.

It was one of the errors of the Pelagians to hold that man could live absolutely free from sin. That the Blessed Virgin so lived, Catholic faith holds. As relates to all other men, we have the definition of the Council of Trent: "If any man shall say, that a man being once justified can through his whole life avoid all sins, even venial sins, except by the special privilege of God, as the Church holds concerning the Blessed Virgin, let him be anathema."—De Justificatione, Can. XXIII. It is in the absolute power of God to thus preserve a creature, but except the Mother of God, we know of no one with whom he has thus dealt. The Lord's prayer contemplates the ordinary course of human life, and thus considered, the prayer is necessary for sinner and saint.

Man never realizes fully the true nature of the infection of sin in the soul and man's dependence on grace. The Pelagian principles flatter human pride, and appeal to the natural man.

That the present petition should be applicable to man, it is not necessary that, at its recital, he stand convicted of unforgiven sins. It suffices that a sin has at some time come into man's life; nay, more; it suffices that man lives in a nature in which sin is a daily possibility.

That which is called here debts is called in the English Catholic form of this prayer a trespass. The word trespass weakens not the original word debt, but accurately specifies it. The debt is not a financial obligation, which the Lord's prayer moves to cancel, but a voluntary transgression of law, which constitutes a sin against God, and in the relations of man to man, it constitutes an injury or offense. Now in asking for the remission of our sins, the prayer lays down the condition on which God may be moved to grant it. The reading of the first aorist ἀφῆκαμεν is to be preferred in the second member of

this verse, and instructs that in the very act of asking the pardon of God, we should be rightly disposed in forgiveness of every one that has offended or injured us. It was this passage which Shakespeare had in mind when he wrote:

“—we do pray for mercy,
And that same prayer doth teach us all to render
The deeds of mercy.”

The text establishes the great importance of forgiveness of injuries, inasmuch as it is made a factor in our daily prayer, and the condition of God's mercy to us. Thus of forgiveness speaketh the Son of Sirach: “Forgive thy neighbor, if he hath hurt thee, and then shall thy sins be forgiven thee, when thou prayest.”—Eccli. XXVIII. 2.

That forgiveness of the neighbor is a necessary condition of God's forgiveness of us is amply evidenced by these texts. Moreover, the plain proof exists in these and other data of inspiration that the forgiveness of the neighbor is the measure of our forgiveness by God. The form of expression of the text in Matthew supports such sense, and this sense is confirmed by Matthew, VII. 2: “For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged: and with what measure ye measure, it shall be measured to you again.”

It would seem, from a consideration of the nature of God and of his relation to man, that it would be sufficient for God to express his will to be obeyed; that the knowledge that God wished a thing would be a motive strong enough to move man to act; and yet the Almighty must needs plead, exhort, and threaten to move a man to do an act of mercy towards his own kind. Therefore besides being a necessary condition and moving cause of God's forgiveness, our forgiveness of injuries is the measure of God's dealings with us. In the words of St. Augustine, we enter into a compact with God, that he forgive us as we forgive others.

The measurement, however, proceeds according to analogy. As the nature of God is exalted above our nature and our comprehension, so is his goodness toward us exalted above our mercy to others. God acts towards us according to his transcendent nature and attributes, and with that high action our

best achievement can not come into comparison. Woe to us, if God limited his mercy and goodness to us to the absolute measure of what he found in us. We do not ask in the Lord's prayer that he so deal with us. But our treatment of others is the measure of God's dealing with us, in this sense, that the more perfectly we shall have followed the law of mercy in dealing with all men, the greater will be God's mercy and favor to us. The nature of God's action remains transcendentally above man's action, and yet the degrees of perfection in our performance of the law of duty, according to the analogy between God and creatures, causes corresponding degrees in God's favorable judgment of us.

The Lord's prayer closes with a petition for preservation from temptation and evil. In praying that God lead us not into temptation, we do not imply that God leads any man into temptation. St. James has given us a clear declaration on this point: "Let no man say when he is tempted: I am tempted of God: for God is ἀπειραστος in evil, neither tempteth he any man: but every man is tempted by his own lust and enticed. Then when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin; and sin, when it is full grown, bringeth forth death."—James, I. 13—15. But inasmuch as nothing can take place in the universe except by God's action or permission, the things which occur by the permission of God are often referred to God as their cause.

We speak here of temptation proper, which may be defined as that which entices to sin, and exposes to the danger of sin. God makes trial of a man's faith and virtue. Thus he made trial of the faith of Abraham by positive act: "And it came to pass after these things, that God did tempt Abraham and said unto him: Abraham; and he said: Behold, here I am. And he said: Take thy son, thine only son Isaac, whom thou lovest, and get thee into the land of Moriah; and offer him there for a burnt offering upon one of the mountains which I will tell thee of."—Gen. XXII. 1—2. The Lord did not thereby entice Abraham to evil, but essayed his faith.

It is compatible with God's dealings with man to move upon him such test. In such manner it is declared in Wisdom, III. 5, that God tempts the just. Of such temptation it is

written in Deuteronomy, XIII. 3: "Thou shalt not hearken unto the words of that prophet or unto that dreamer of dreams: for the Lord your God proveth you to know whether ye love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul." Corporal suffering, affliction and trial, loss of property, disease, persecution, and other ills are also called temptations. Thus St. Paul was tempted, and Tobias: "And because thou wert pleasing to God, it was necessary that temptation should test thee."—Tob. XII. 13. It is of this temptation that St. James speaks: "My brethren, count it all joy when ye fall into divers temptations; knowing this that the *trying of your faith worketh* patience."—James, I. 2-3. And of this temptation he speaketh again in the twelfth verse: "Blessed is the man that endureth temptation; for when he is tried, he shall receive the crown of life, which the Lord hath promised to them that love him." Now God may, be the positive cause of all such temptations, as St. Paul saith: "For whom the Lord loveth, he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth."—Heb. XII. 6. The Lord's prayer is not aimed to secure exemption from such temptation.

But there is another species of temptation which has as cause the forces of evil in the universe. Some of these forces are within us, the lust of the flesh, the disordered movements of the passions,—in a word, "the law of the members." These inner incentives to sin are moved to action by certain external causes of various nature, and the whole is subject to the action of the arch-tempter Satan. Now such temptation is an evil thing, which every man should desire to avoid. A man may lawfully desire the temptation of trial, persecution, pain, poverty, and the like, but we are to fly from the evil temptation as from a positive danger. It is true that the Christian passing through the evil temptations unscathed acquires thereby merit, but no man should desire such an essay. When we rightly measure the power of evil and the weakness of our own nature, we are persuaded that unaided we can not cope with the mighty forces that oppose us. This is not cowardice, but a proper and wise estimate of the nature of human life. If God should withhold his hand, and allow the evil temptation to come upon us unrestrained, who should be saved? Hence these words move

a man to mistrust himself, to put aside accursed security; they move man to a proper estimate of his needs, and to recognize the source of his strength.

The proper object of this petition is first that God may avert temptation. God may, in his wisdom, see where the very presence of temptation may benefit man, but such vision is not given to man, and man's duty is by all possible means to escape from evil temptation. Such is the command of Christ to us in Matthew XXVI. 41: "Watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation; the spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak." Christ does not restrict the petition to ask that we *fall not in* temptation, but he exhorts us to pray that temptation come not upon us. We are weaker than we know, and though we stand now, perhaps it is because God in mercy kept back temptations which would have borne us away.

Another object of this petition is to seek help from God to stand fast in temptation. God's dealings with man in temptation are outlined by St. Paul, I. Cor. X. 13: "There hath no temptation taken you, but such as man can bear; but God is faithful who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able; but will with temptation also make the way to escape, that ye may be able to bear it." Hence, in the present petition of the Lord's prayer, we daily invest our lives with the saving protection of God; we place the issue in his hands. With truthful humility, we acknowledge our weakness and dependence. We leave to God to judge and determine the mode in which he will deal with the temptation; we simply implore his help in the ways which his wisdom shall determine.

This help will come to us from God in various ways. At times it will be a direct intervention of God to prevent the attack of temptation; again it will be a spiritual force communicated to the soul, by which it is strengthened to combat successfully; and again it will be a tempering of the onslaught of Satan, and of the rebellion of the flesh, to keep it within our power to resist.

We do not know the multifarious ways in which the power of God shields us from temptation, and sustains us in temptation. It is not necessary for us to know just how he is operating. Infinite wisdom regulates that. The ultimate object of

our desire and our petition is to save ourselves from falling in temptation. We pray for this ultimate result by asking God to keep us out of temptation, for we know our weakness. And the full sense of that petition is that God may avert temptation, temper temptation, aid us in temptation, in the ways that he judges shall be good for us; that by his aid we may stand before him without crime.

Some consider the next petition: "Deliver us from evil," as a positive form of that which is sought in the foregoing petition. A proposition is strengthened by being first introduced by the negation of its contrary, and then propounded in its positive form. Thus of the Eucharist, Christ declares first that: "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of God, and drink his blood, ye shall have no life in you;" which he straightway enforces by the positive declaration: "He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day."—John, VI. 53-54. Such was the mind of Jansenius on this passage.

But it seems that the petition, "deliver us from evil," includes more than deliverance from temptation. It includes deliverance from falling in evil temptations, but it does not stop here, but extends to every evil which troubles the life of man.

To render the sense of the proposition clear we must first determine what is meant by the word "evil." As the term occurs in the Greek text in an oblique case, we can not determine from the text whether it be the masculine or neuter form of the term. Maldonatus interprets the term of the devil, and cites in support of his opinion Tertullian, Chrysostom and his followers, Theophylactus and Euthymius. According to Knabenbauer, Gregory of Nyssa, Chromatius, Faber Stapulensis, and of moderns, Bisping and Schanz support this opinion.

King James' version agreed with the Vulgate in interpreting the term of evil in general. The Revised Edition of Oxford changed the translation, rendering the passage, "deliver us from the evil one." The revisers however give the old reading, "deliver us from evil," in the margin.

There seems to be no sufficient motive to restrict the term to the sole signification of the devil.

As he is evil, and the source of much of man's evil, it certainly includes him, but we believe that it goes farther, and signifies every thing that has the nature or relation of evil. Knabenbauer defends this view, and cites in support of it St. Cyprian, Augustine, the author of the *Opus Imperfectum*, Bede, Paschasius, Bruno, St. Thomas, Albertus Magnus, Cajetan, Salmeron, Jansenius, Barradius, Suarez, Sylveira, Lamy, Arnoldi, Reischl, Fillion; and among protestants, Ewald, Tholuck, Kamphausen, Keil, Mansel, Weiss and others.

The intrinsic evidence also favors this view. The petition is for deliverance from evil, evil in general, evil in all its forms, evil as the popular mind apprehends it. Why should we, without any warrant, restrict this to the personal devil?

In the Old Testament *ὁ πονηρός* is never used to designate the devil.

The words of St. Cyprian are apposite here: "After all these things, at the close of the prayer there is a clause briefly recapitulating all our petitions and prayers. For at the end we say, '—but deliver us from evil,' contemplating therein all the evils that the tempter operates against us in this world; from which evils we have a safe and sure protection if God delivers us; if God gives help to those who implore it. When we say, '—deliver us from evil,' we need ask for nothing more, since we implore the protection of God against evil. When God's protection is obtained, we stand secure and safe against all that the devil and the world can do. For what should man fear in this world, when God protects him?"

Cajetan declares: "In this petition we pray that our mortal life, our health, goods, and everything else whether good or bad should not become for us a spiritual evil, which is the only absolute evil."

Suarez explains it as follows: "It was fitting that Christ should teach us that we should seek from God deliverance from all these evils (war, pestilence, and famine, and the like), for he alone can deliver us from them, and he does it when it advantages us; for such condition is included in the petition, and

needs not be expressed. After that we have asked for the necessary goods of this life, we likewise ask for deliverance from the contrary evils."

It is true, that Christ uses the term *ὁ πονηρός* in Matthew XIII. 19, to signify the evil spirit; but there the context plainly demands such sense of the term. We freely concede that the term can and does signify the devil, but we believe that the present text is weakened by limiting it solely to Satan. He is included as prince of the universe of evil, but we pray for deliverance from the entire universe of evil. Every moral evil makes for Satan; hence those who interpret the term of the devil must needs see included there all those evil forces whose tendency is to draw man to the service of the evil one. We see in the petition a prayer for deliverance from all evil universally considered.

The character of the causes which affect the life of man is either good or evil. In the preceding petitions man prays for good. The proper comprehension of those petitions includes all good, even temporal good, asked for in the petition for daily bread. The prayer is balanced by the petition for deliverance from all evil. The term evil naturally calls up in the mind of man the idea of evil in general. Hence the term applies to both moral and physical evil. Of course, the only absolute evil is moral evil; physical evils may be blessings in disguise. But still it is not incompatible with the spirit of the Gospel to pray for exemption from physical evil. The Church has the Spirit of God, and she prays to be delivered from war, pestilence, famine, sickness and from the other ills. That prayer is acceptable to God which places all the events of man's life under the Providence of God. Jesus himself prayed to be exempted from the crucifixion. In this petition, therefore, we pray that God may preserve us from everything which the human mind naturally considers as evil, which object includes the evil of the moral and the physical worlds.

In the great life of the Church, multitudes are forever sending up petitions for deliverance from physical evils. Will any man say that these are in error? that their prayer is not rightly framed? But the Lord's Prayer is the model of all prayer, and therefore if it omitted this object of man's prayer,

it would be wanting in one of man's great needs. God earnestly asks to be allowed to come into human life thus intimately; that we recognize every good as coming from him; and that we fly to him in every need. Certainly he who came forth from the eternal Trinity to teach man how to pray, would not have overlooked that important relation of divine Providence to man which consists in saving man from physical evil.

We have before stated that the *Amen* pertains not to the words of Christ, but is a mere liturgical response.

Few things are so hard for human nature to do as to forgive offenses and injuries. It is equally certain that it is an indispensable condition for salvation. In wisdom, therefore, Christ lays greater stress on this point of the prayer, setting forth the respective effects of forgiveness and non-forgiveness of injuries. Of course, the fourteenth and fifteenth verses are to be understood *suppositis supponendis*. They do not mean that the forgiveness of injuries constitutes the sole duty of man, and that its observance alone insures Heaven to man, and its transgression hell. The nature of such propositions is that they are universal in the negative sense, and limited in their affirmative sense. Hence these propositions establish a *conditio sine qua non* of salvation; while they promise in their affirmative sense that our forgiveness of others will move God to show all mercy to us that is compatible with God's truth and justice. The thought is expressed in that form to secure the force of the antithesis. God takes cognizance of our act, and makes of it a motive of his action, to the effect that he shows the greatest mercy to the man who has been most generous in his forgiveness of his fellow men.

MATT. VI. 16—18.

16. Moreover when ye fast, be not, as the hypocrites, of a sad countenance: for they disfigure their faces, that they may be seen of men to fast. Verily I say unto you: They have received their reward.

16. Ὅταν δὲ νηστεύητε, μὴ γίνεσθε ὡς οἱ ὑποκριταὶ σκυθρωποὶ: ἀφανίζουσι γὰρ τὰ πρόσωπα ἑαυτῶν ὅπως φανῶσιν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις νηστεύοντες: ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἀπέχουσιν τὸν μισθὸν αὐτῶν.

17. But thou, when thou fastest, anoint thy head, and wash thy face;

17. Σὺ δὲ νηστεύων ἄλειψαί σου τὴν κεφαλὴν καὶ τὸ πρόσωπόν σου νίψαι:

18. That thou be not seen of men to fast, but of thy Father who is in secret: and thy Father, who seeth in secret, shall recompense thee.

18. Ὅπως μὴ φανῇς νηστεύων τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, ἀλλὰ τῷ Πατρὶ σου τῷ ἐν τῷ κρυφαίῳ, καὶ ὁ Πατὴρ σου ὁ βλέπων ἐν τῷ κρυφαίῳ ἀποδώσει σοι.

Fasting is included among the duties of religion both in the Old Law and in the New. One of the proofs that protestantism is not of God is that it has eliminated this work from the duties of man. In the Old Law one yearly solemn fast was appointed: "And this shall be a statute for ever with you; that in the seventh month, on the tenth day of the month, ye shall afflict your souls, etc."—Lev. XVI. 29. But besides this, there were public fasts in times of calamity and war, and private fasts, which were especially practised by the Pharisees, to establish themselves in the esteem of the people. These fasts formed an element in a homogeneous system of outward religious observances, in which God had been eliminated, and superseded by dry forms.

On the solemn fast, Pharisaic teaching forbade to eat, to drink, to wash the body or any portion thereof, to anoint one's self, or put on the sandals. The Jews in fasting also smeared their faces with ashes. They contented themselves with these outward austerities. This smearing of the face with ashes, and an affected expression of penitence is that to which the Lord refers in saying that the hypocrites disfigure their faces. The Greek term employed in this passage is ἀφανίζουσιν, which is very inadequately rendered by the *exterminant* of the Vulgate. The basic signification of ἀφανίζειν is to make unseen. Hence the derived meanings of to make away with, to raze to the ground, to erase (writing), to darken, obscure, tarnish. In the present predication, it undoubtedly means to disfigure the features of the human countenance by the outward signs of penance.

The outward sign of penance was not in itself bad. The Lord had often commanded public penance. The men of

Nineveh placated the Lord by doing penance in sackcloth and ashes. But it was the motive which vitiated the penance of the Pharisees. There was no interior penance, and therefore the outward indication was a lie. The human face is beautiful when animated by the soul, but when the soul has departed, the face becomes ghastly and repulsive. So with these external acts of penance. They were a body without a soul. It was a mere smearing of the face without a change of heart. They did their acts for men, and that motive so changed the nature of the act that it had nothing for God, and received nothing from God. Accommodating his language to the customs of the people of that day, the Lord establishes the right law of fasting. The formal element of everything done for God must be interior. So the Lord bids that in our fastings we keep our work from the notice of men.

In sorrow and mourning the men of old washed not their faces, nor anointed themselves with oil, but in joy and festive rejoicing they did both. So David, when his fast was over, "arose from the earth, and washed and anointed himself, and changed his apparel."—I. Sam. XII. 20. The Jews also anointed themselves with oil as a customary preliminary for appearance in public.

Now the Lord's bidding in the present instance reflects the customs of his times, but it is broader than its mere letter. In a Hebrew phrase, he propounds the law of fasting to be to make it an affair between God and the soul, and by a joyous countenance, and proper care of the person to keep from the knowledge of men what the soul is doing for God. The central thought of the passage might be tersely expressed as follows: Make not the judgment of the world and the approbation of men the motive of your good work, and shun such marks of austerity as would draw upon your work the notice of men. The spirit of these words is not aimed to move a man to conform to the vain, thoughtless, pleasure-seeking spirit of the world. An air of religious seriousness at all times, and a withdrawal from worldly pleasures in seasons commemorative of Christ's sufferings are edifying to men, and pleasing to God. But these things must not be as an outer cloak to an unchastened heart.

Neither is it opposed to the spirit of Christ's teaching that the faithful kneel before the altar of God, and receive the ashes of penance on their heads. In the first place, this is a common practice of all the children of the Church, and thus affords no ground for affected sanctity. It is an act of obedience, highly honorable to Christ, by which we make open profession that we believe in his Redemption through suffering, and this outward sign is given us to move us to the interior penance of the heart, as the formal element in our observance of corporal works of mortification. The outward sign is a very little thing, the sign of our Captain, but through it the voice of God speaks to our souls through the Church, bidding us purify our hearts by that penance which God alone sees and rewards. No man ever knelt and received that sign with the end thereby to glorify himself by reputed sanctity. All receive it as a mere symbol of a reality which is to be acquired by an unostentatious following of the law of chastisement of the flesh.

MATT. VI. 19-21.

19. Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon the earth, where moth and rust doth consume, and where thieves break through and steal;

19. Μὴ θησαυρίζετε ὑμῖν θησαυροὺς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ὅπου σῆς καὶ βρώσις ἀφανίζει καὶ ὅπου κλέπται διορύσσουσιν καὶ κλέπτουσιν.

20. But lay up for yourselves treasures in Heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth consume, and where thieves do not break through nor steal:

20. Θησαυρίζετε δὲ ὑμῖν θησαυροὺς ἐν οὐρανῷ ὅπου οὔτε σῆς οὔτε βρώσις ἀφανίζει καὶ ὅπου κλέπται οὐ διορύσσουσιν οὐδὲ κλέπτουσιν.

21. For where thy treasure is, there will thy heart be also.

21. Ὅπου γάρ ἐστιν ὁ θησαυρός σου, ἐκεῖ ἔσται ἡ καρδιά σου.

It is vain to seek a close logical nexus between the present theme and the foregoing. The great themes of the Sermon on the Mount are unified only on the broad basis of the Christian's law of conduct. Hence Christ passes from one principle to another within the plane of that great law.

One of the mighty forces of human life is the lust of riches. What its ravages have been in our nation's life is ably set forth by Dr. Hale: "Beloved America, child of the world's old age, she has come, clad in the splendor of her youth, magnificent in her colossal materialism; but unfurnished in the serious, nobler, and more necessary things—to the days when the burden of life must rest upon her, and her people arise and face the tremendous issues, in whose midst nations meet their destiny. A people of great mental keenness,—energetic, swift; undeniably a vulgar people, with sordid, mercenary, contemptible ways of living, but as undeniably brave, capable of great deeds of nobleness. God has given us this great continent, and he has brought here upon it to its present stage this vast society and life, intricate, complex, full of wrong and full of promise, and he has led us to this wonderful hour of crisis.

No man can describe this people or measure its characteristics, as no man (yet manifest among us) can interpret the signification, or guess the end of the mighty movement which is passing before our eyes. That we are at this moment a fallen nation, an apostate people, enslaved by a gluttonous materialism, and (that we are) a disappointment to our God, an awakening conscience among us bears witness."—Rev. Wm. B. Hale, LL. D., in *Arena*, March, 1898.

God has given to man, powers of body and mind, and there is in man a natural propensity to expend these in the acquisition of some possession. The movement of life is not towards inertia, but towards action and achievement. Now the great defect is that those mighty powers are expended upon things which only serve the corruptible nature of man, and benefit in nowise the higher interests of human life.

The Lord wishes not to eliminate from man the tendency to exercise his powers on something, but he directs to an object worthy of those high powers.

The treasures of earth are various, comprised under the great head of riches and possessions. The Lord dissuades a man from following these by the consideration of their caducity. In the reasoning of the Lord, all worldly goods are subject to moth, rust, and thieves.

Some difficulty exists here in ascertaining the exact sense of *βρῶσις*, which the English translations render rust. The basic signification of the term is an act of eating; hence it is often used to signify the thing eaten, food. Knabenbauer applies it to signify the corruption that comes upon the fruits of the earth. The common opinion explains the term of the rust of metals. It may be that the *βρῶσις* is to be taken in a large sense for the eating away of earthly treasures by *tempus edax rerum*. The thought is well expressed by Ovid in Lib. XV. *Metam.* 234:

“Tempus edax rerum, tuque invidiosa vetustas,
Omnia destruitis: vitiataque dentibus ævi
Paulatim lenta consumitis omnia morte.”

Another defect that earthly possessions are subject to, is the depredations of thieves. The Lord keeps the argument in a very humble plane. He properly contemplates the case of a breaking in of thieves, and the carrying off of a man's goods. In that age and country, the great world of commerce and business was not developed as it is with us. Trusts, and stocks, and bonds were unknown. The question which presented itself to one who had acquired money in those days was not how to make a safe investment but how to preserve his money safe. Of course, there was some borrowing of money on interest, but on a very primitive scale. But even in our vast world of business the argument of Christ holds good. There is no absolute security in business. Now Christ exhorts man to spend his life in pursuit of the better things, which are not subject to the aforesaid vicissitudes. The words of Christ here mean more than the mere letter imports. He speaks of the moth and the *βρῶσις* and the thieves not in the intention that these be the only considerations which move a man to indifference towards worldly goods. But it is an easy figure to teach men the diversity in nature between the two kinds of possessions. The moth, the *βρῶσις*, and thieves simply signify that all the goods of this earth are corruptible and uncertain, and that they can not be accounted a permanent possession. They are creatures of time, and will change and pass with time. “It is fearful how we stand enveloped, deep-sunk in that mystery

of time; and are all sons of time, fashioned and woven out of time; and on us, and on all that we have, or see, or do is written: Rest not, continue not. Forward to thy doom."

The real reason intended by Christ to draw our hearts away from the pursuit of worldly things is not that such goods are merely subject to casualties and accidents, but that they are corruptible, and that they pass with time. And the vicissitudes enumerated are only adduced to show how base and worthless is the nature of the things for which a man gives his soul. And conversely, Heaven's goods are not asserted to transcend earthly goods only in that they are exempt from these vicissitudes, but this exemption is stated to draw men's minds to the high consideration that these goods are immutable, incorruptible, and eternal.

What a gigantic loss of human energy is daily wasted in this great busy world? And all because man will not receive the message of those words. When we contrast the careful thought, the eager longing, the intense and sustained effort, which Christians themselves give to the advancement of worldly interests, with the thoughtlessness, the supine indolence, carelessness of futurity, and slothful inertia which characterize their religious life, we are filled with wonderment.

In this easy concrete example Christ establishes the unchanging nature and eternity of Heaven's possessions. No man who believes in Heaven at all doubts of the high nature of its constituents. No man ever imagined that his riches would serve him after death. And yet man longs for the things of earth, feels sad when he is without these, satisfied when he has them. The possession of them makes man in a measure inaccessible to religious influence. It makes the possessor self-satisfied, self-conceited, and resentful of interference. The explanation of this perversion of man's powers to follow after the things of earth lies chiefly in the fact that Heaven is not sufficiently a reality to us. The senses make the goods of earth real to us, the things which are eternal are not seen; and faith is not intense enough to make their motive power equal to that of the transient things of earth.

Beautiful are the lines of Dante, as in poetic fancy he stood in the eighth heaven and looked down on this earth:

“Col viso ritornai per tutte quante
 Le sette spere, e vidi questo globo
 Tal, ch' io sorrisi del suo vil sembiante;
 E quel consiglio per migliore approbo
 Che l'ha per meno; e chi ad altro pensa
 Chiamar si puote veramente probo.”

Par. XXII. 133-138.

Another truth of great importance is established by the words of Christ, that different degrees in man's future life in Heaven correspond to grades of excellence in man's good works here on earth. As on earth greater thrift and industrious labor place some above others in worldly possessions, so it is in Heaven. Of course, in transferring the comparison to Heaven, we must relieve it of all that is imperfect. A man may labor for the goods of earth, and fail, and lose his labor; he can not lose a tittle in laboring for Heaven. A man may labor for the world, and be unappreciated, and wronged of that which is his; in laboring for Heaven, his wages are absolutely sure. It is this absolute security and eternal endurance of these possessions that Christ holds out here to us to invite us to follow after them. Hence Christ addresses to man a message through these words and says: "Heaven is opened up to thy endeavor. There is innate in thee a desire to possess something; behold, I point out the proper object toward which to direct that activity. Here thou mayest accumulate eternal wealth, which no power can change or take from thee. Dost thou desire to become rich, and raise thyself to eminence? Do so, but in the proper order of things. Not only are the goods to which I call thee sure and enduring, but thy success is assured, if thou labor. And the more thou laborest, the more everlasting riches are prepared for thee."

Instead then of regarding Heaven as a cold abstraction, we should regard it as the shrewd business man regards his banks and his stocks, his bonds and his lands. If we could once transfer to our spiritual life the intensity and energy of business, what a tidal wave would sweep over the world, in the direction of righteousness? And yet the greater value of our eternal interests should move us in far greater degree.

In the twenty-first verse, the Lord assigns the reason of his preceding exhortation. The sentence of that verse may have been a proverb among the people. It is a condensed truth which explains a whole world of thought and human experience. Man's heart will be where his treasurers are, and where man's heart is, thitherward will be the trend of his life. Man can not constitute his treasure upon earth, and follow Christ towards Heaven. Man's treasure is the things he loves, the things which he wishes to hold and possess. Now the nature of man is such that this treasure operates on man as the force of gravitation upon bodies. In this place the sentence of Augustine is pertinent: "*Amor meus pondus meum; ubi amo, ibi feror.*" Man, in his proper development, will set his heart upon some treasure, and on the choice of that treasure depends the character of his life. If that treasure is upon earth, it will impress upon man that peculiar character of worldliness which is so prevalent in our age. The remedy must be radical. It can consist in nothing save the making of the treasures of Heaven a reality in our lives, the great living reality for which we live and labor.

MATT. VI. 22-23.

22. The lamp of the body is the eye: if therefore thine eye be single, thy whole body shall be full of light.

22. Ὁ λύχνος τοῦ σώματος ἐστὶν ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου: ἐὰν οὖν ᾗ ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου ἀπλοῦς, ὅλον τὸ σῶμά σου φωτεινὸν ἔσται.

23. But if thine eye be evil, thy whole body shall be full of darkness. If therefore the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is the darkness?

23. Ἐὰν δὲ ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου πονηρὸς ᾗ, ὅλον τὸ σῶμά σου σκοτεινὸν ἔσται. Εἰ οὖν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἐν σοὶ σκότος ἐστίν, τὸ σκότος πόσον;

In the twenty-second verse the omission of the pronouns is supported by the authority of the Greek codices, the old versions, and of many codices of the Vulgate. It is undoubtedly the true reading. The sentence lays down a general proposition; the light of every body is the eye. This would be weakened by the restrictive force of the pronouns.

In the same verse the Vulgate renders the *ἀπλοῦς* by simplex. It is uncertain what sense it attributes to it. The term simplex can be taken in a physical or a moral sense, but it is certain that the Saviour here intended the physical sense. And the same is true of its opposite the *πουνηρός* of the next verse. It signifies a physical ailment of the organ of vision.

The language of the Lord in this passage is metaphorical, but to understand its full force, we must first explain the natural basis of the metaphor. The eye is the light of the body, inasmuch as by its power of vision it puts us in communication with external nature. It is thus also the guide of the body. It guides the feet in their movements, and guides the hands; and, in a word, the eye by its power of vision leads the man in all his external acts. Consequently a defect in the eye reacts upon the whole body. If it is sound and healthy, *ἀπλοῦς*, the whole body receives light thence to perform its functions; while if it be diseased, *πουνηρός*, its defective action is felt by the whole body. Hence the Lord applies this natural truth in a metaphorical sense to the moral life of man. The eye enlightens and directs the body, and there is a corresponding faculty in the soul which directs the moral life of man. That interior directing act is the joint act of the reason and will. It is the act of the reason judging of the nature of things, and directing the soul to its proper good, and it is the act of the will, which moves to the attainment of that good. The act therefore includes judgment and desire, and the faculties exercising in union this act are called by the Saviour the heart. This great act leads human life. The empire of the mind is chiefly with the intellect, but yet the will must move with it; otherwise a man might apprehend the real good, and commend it, but through defect of will, follow baser things. Now if this great act of the faculties of man becomes so darkened that it leaves man's chief good, and follows after the things of earth, it will set the course of human life wrong, even in its source. There is a mutual influence exercised by will upon intellect, and by intellect upon will, and when the riches of this world become the chief object of the desires, the intellect is in darkness. The

moral darkness thickens in man's soul; those faculties which should have guided him are diseased; and man, though created for Heaven, settles down to enjoy the carrion of the earth.

The material light which is a necessary condition for human activity is applied to the body's use through the eye. If the eye be defective, the light fails, not through any defect in the light itself, but through the defect in the very member of the human body that should have administered light to all the body's members. So in the spiritual order God graciously gives light that man may know and receive the truth. This light comes through the Son of God who is "the light which lighteth every man that cometh into this world." That light came to the Jews, and they received it not. Now when the soul of man hardens itself against the light itself; when it sins against the light, and impugns the known truth, it commits the awful sin against the Holy Ghost, and places itself in that state mentioned by Christ as the state of the evil eye, when the light itself becomes darkness. That the soul should exercise its spiritual activities to do the will of God, it must have light; but if it shut out the light by the very faculty ordained by God for receiving the light, inevitably a great spiritual darkness must follow. No condition can be conceived more terrible than this. Man thus cuts off the very source and first principle of grace. It is not a mere shutting out of the light, but it is the ruin of the source through which light comes; therefore as the source of light fails, Christ declares that the light itself becomes darkness.

The great aim of Christ is to set the course of human life in the right direction by establishing in its proper place the right object of man's desires and love. This act of the faculties is intended by God to be the motive power of man's action, to be the leading power of his life, and when that is vitiated, being diverted from its proper object, how great shall the darkness and disorder of man's nature be? The desire of the heart is like a fountain where all lines of action have their source. The influence of that fountain should be to counteract the many agencies of corruption to which its streams are liable, by constantly pouring in its clear pure flood, but when the fountain itself is vitiated all is lost.

MATT. VI. 24.

24. No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and Mammon.

24. Οὐδεὶς δύναται δυσὶ κυρίοις δουλεύειν: ἢ γὰρ τὸν ἓνα μισήσει καὶ τὸν ἕτερον ἀγαπήσει, ἢ ἐνὸς ἀνθέξεται καὶ τοῦ ἑτέρου καταφρονήσει: οὐ δύνασθε Θεῷ δουλεύειν καὶ μαμωνᾷ.

The entire passage is of the same tenor. In the twenty-fourth verse the Lord attacks the position of those who endeavor to reconcile the service of God with the lust of riches and the pursuit of the goods of this life. To the preceding argument of Christ, the exception might have been urged, that a man might have his heart both in the treasures of Heaven and those of earth, desiring and seeking the goods of earth for his present period of existence, at the same time giving thought to the higher things for the future. Now by the present declaration the Lord proclaims that to be impossible.

In human life man is placed at the fork of two roads. He can not travel both these roads at once; he must elect one. There are two masters of human life, and their respective service differs as to these two roads. To serve a master, in the present phraseology of the Lord, is to devote all the powers of one's being to the interest of such a master, to follow him as a soldier does his captain. How can a man follow and serve thus two masters who lead by different roads? Now at the fork of these roads Christ stands, and says to man: "You can not serve the world and me; you must choose one and leave the other."

The rectitude of that election is for the soul what the light of the eyes is for the body. If that choice be a real will, and not a mere velleity, it will impress a real character on man's life, and will shape it after the nature of the master it serves.

That no man can serve two masters is a general proposition, admitting no exception. To assail it, one must needs attack the first principle of contradiction, and assert that a thing may be and not be at the same time. But it is not so clear that the service of one master involves the hate and contempt of the other. To explain this, we must recognize that

the terms *μισεῖν* and *καταφρονεῖν* are used here to express the same idea. They are used here in a peculiar Scriptural sense. In such predication, they mean simply to love one thing less than another. They are frequently used in this sense to express the relinquishing of one object for the election of the other. When two motives present themselves to man, of which he can only attain one, the act of election of one involves the rejection of the other, and this act of rejection is called by the Lord to hate or despise. In like manner, Christ commands man to hate his father, mother, brother and sister.

The term Mammon is only found in Scripture in the discourses of our Lord. Some believe that it is derived from the Hebrew *מַמְּוֹן*. *thesaurus*, from root *מָמַן*. *to store away*. At all events, it is certain that in the Aramaic tongue it signified the god of riches; and riches are here personified in the term. St. Augustine testifies that in the Punic tongue Mammon was the god of riches.

Two mighty forces operate on man, the service of God and the service of Mammon. All the natural motives are marshalled on the side of Mammon; the motives which operate for God are in the supernatural order, and are only available through faith.

Surely a man may *use* Mammon's goods, and *serve* God; but he cannot *serve* Mammon and also *serve* God. "Imperat aut servit regina pecunia cuique." The saying of Rama Krishna well illustrates this point: "A boat may stay in the water, but the water should not stay in the boat. An aspirant may live in the world, but the world should not live in him."

To serve God is to make God the chief good of our lives, to seek in God the motive which shapes the course of our lives, to subordinate to God's love and service every other interest which may come into our lives. That supreme motive stands as the great law and guiding principle in all that the true servant of God aims at, and in all that he does, so that the product of the days of his life is such that he can offer it to God as the result of his service.

Of course, there will be an indefinite range of degree in that service. In everything where human effort is expended

we find different degrees of intensity; but there must be in all, even the least, a general conformity to the foregoing principles, or else there is no service.

Hence all of human life that is not a positive service of God is wasted. Here again the range extends from mere non-acquisition, through waste of time and opportunity, to positive sin. Some waste much and save a little of their lives for the service of God; others waste all. Few, very few, develop for God all the rich possibilities of human life.

To give that service to God, one must swim against the current. The world never has served, and never will serve God. One hears the world's voices all about. It is only by breaking away from the world's course of thought and action that one can hear the voice of God inly speaking, and follow him whither he leadeth.

To serve Mammon is to intrude the love of worldly possessions into our lives as our chief good; to make property the ruling aim of our lives. Few men will explicitly declare such to be the ruling motive of their lives. For the most part, men serve Mammon without being conscious that they have dedicated the powers of their being to him. It is easy to serve him, for he draws in the direction of the current of the world. His incentives appeal to the senses, and sensible things readily move us.

St. Chrysostom declares: "Understand not those mentioned here to be the rich, but those who serve riches: Job was rich, but he served not Mammon. He had riches and retained them; but he was the master, not the slave, of riches."

In the *Opus Imperfectum* the author says: "It is one thing to have riches; it is another thing to serve riches. If thou hast riches and riches make thee neither proud nor unjust; if thou give to the needy according to thy means thou art the master, not the slave, of thy riches; for thy riches possess thee not, but thou possessest thy riches." In the words of the Psalmist, "If riches increase, set not your heart thereon."—Ps. LXII. 10. [Vulg. LXI.]

The enormous power of riches in human life has always been recognized. Petronius made Jove himself subject to their power:

“Quidvis nummis præsentibus opta,
Et veniet; clausum possidet arca Jovem.”

The condition of our own times is mirrored in the following lines:

“Nunc Vulgus superos vix putat esse deos;
Nimirum ingenti congesta pecunia cura
Est deus; humanas nunc regit illa vices.”

In the II. letter to Cæsar, “De Republica Ordinanda,” the author, who is supposed by some to have been Sallust, thus discourses of the power of money: “Sed multo maximum bonum patriæ, civibus, tibi, liberis, postremo humanæ genti pepereris si *STUDIUM PECUNIÆ* aut sustuleris, aut, quod res feret, minueris. Aliter, neque, privata res, neque publica, neque domi, neque militiæ regi potest. Nam ubi cupidus divitiarum invasit; neque disciplina, neque artes bonæ, neque ingenium ullum satis pollet, quin animus magis aut minus mature postremo tamen succumbit. . . . Postremo ubi divitiæ clares habentur, ibi omnia bona vilia sunt, fides, probitas, pudor, pudicitia. Nam ad virtutem una et ardua via est, ad pecuniam qua cuique lubet nititur; et malis et bonis rebus ea creatur. . . . Ceterum avaritia bellua fera, immanis, intoleranda est: quo intendit, oppida, agros, fana atque domos vastat; divina cum humanis permiscet: neque exercitus, neque moenia obstant quo minus vi sua penetret.”

It is impossible to lay down the same rule for all. There are chosen souls called to a life of perfect renunciation, but all cannot hear this call. Others are to serve God in the world, and for them the great question is how to use the world without abusing it. The words of Christ doubtless mean that, in the measure in which we serve Mammon, in that same measure do we steal away our service from God.

The encroachment of Mammon in some does not absorb the whole life; in others it does; so that a life may be infected with Mammon's service, and yet not be totally taken from God. But wherever the chief aim of life is the love of bustle and

management, the desire of gain, the aiming at influence and importance, that life is given up to the service of Mammon, in one form or other, to the exclusion of all deep, all holy, all calm, all reverent thoughts. Such a man's heart is in the concerns of the world, the things of God have lost their savor for him. Such a man may be saved in some way, but his salvation must rest upon some other basis than the service of God. The devil daily buys souls for money which he could not have by any other means. With the love of money he makes men irreligious, and then they are opened up to the ravages of other sins.

As we are dealing with a theme of tremendous importance it behooves us to be accurate in just what we mean by the service of Mammon. As we have before stated, there is a lawful use of Mammon, which is not service. It is not to serve Mammon to acquire property, to engage in business, to give time and thought and labor to an honest gainful occupation or business. It is more perfect to renounce all, and follow Christ, but all men can not follow that degree of perfection. But it is to serve Mammon to hold this world so near and close to us that it leaves no room for any other world. It is to serve Mammon, when the supreme object of our thoughts, affections, and endeavors is worldly success and prosperity. Man's life is moved to service by the apprehension and desire of some good. Now God demands to be man's chief good in this life, as he is to be his supreme good hereafter. He leaves to Mammon a subordinate place, and if the subordination be just and proper God may be served through the pursuit and possession of worldly goods. But if we invert the order, and make the great business of life the pursuit of riches, we then serve Mammon.

But we must distinguish between the sensible love and the appreciative love. The sensible love is that which springs from our nature acting under the empire of the senses; the appreciative love is founded on the cool judgment of the intellect. To illustrate, we feel more sensible grief at the loss of a dear kinsman or friend than at the loss of righteousness by sin. But yet the appreciation of righteousness is greater, though it moves us less sensibly. So also the interest in worldly affairs may move our sensible nature more forcibly, and yet

leave the appreciative love to God, as the supreme good of the soul. Wherever therefore God and his law are held supreme in the appreciative love of the soul, the man is not serving Mammon, even though his sensible interest in worldly pursuits is strong.

It is possible that the higher intellectual appreciation should grow so strong that it will purify and refine the sensible love, so that even the sensible love will be trained to fasten itself to the supreme good. This is perfection, and the aim of life should be towards it. The opposite is often verified, that the lower love being continually developed assumes the ascendancy, absorbs all the thought, all the love, and all the energy of man's being. To serve Mammon is to love the world with an intense love, and cling to its goods. This dulls the supernatural appetite. The world assumes the position of a god in the man's life; man's taste is educated to love it, and no other, and it supplants God himself in the soul.

It is vain then to endeavor to move ordinary men to perfect renunciation. Such of course is the best *in se*, but all cannot bear it. What should be insisted on is to preserve the right relation between the two orders of goods, even in the pursuit of temporal goods, and endeavor to restrain the overweening influence of the prizes of the world.

MATT. VI. 25—34.

25. Therefore I say unto you: Be not anxious for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on. Is not the life more than the food, and the body than the raiment?

26. Behold the birds of the heaven, that they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns; and your heavenly Father feedeth them. Are not ye of much more value than they?

25. Διὰ τοῦτο λέγω ὑμῖν: μὴ μεριμνᾶτε τῇ ψυχῇ ὑμῶν τί φάγητε ἢ τί πίνητε, μηδὲ τῷ σώματι ὑμῶν τί ἐνδύσθητε: οὐχὶ ἡ ψυχὴ πλεονόν ἐστιν τῆς τροφῆς καὶ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ ἐνδύματος;

26. Ἐμβλέψατε εἰς τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ὅτι οὐ σπείρουσιν οὐδὲ θερίζουσιν οὐδὲ συνάγουσιν εἰς ἀποθήκας καὶ ὁ Πατὴρ ἡμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος τρέφει αὐτά: οὐχ ὑμεῖς μᾶλλον διαφέρετε αὐτῶν;

27. And which of you by being anxious can add one cubit unto his stature?

28. And why are ye anxious concerning raiment? Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin:

29. Yet I say unto you, that even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these.

30. But if God doth so clothe the grass of the field, which to-day is, and to-morrow is cast into the oven, shall he not much more clothe you, O ye of little faith?

31. Be not therefore anxious, saying: What shall we eat? or, What shall we drink? or, Wherewithal shall we be clothed?

32. For after all these things do the Gentiles seek; for your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things.

33. But seek ye first his righteousness, and his kingdom; and all these things shall be added unto you.

34. Be not therefore anxious for the morrow: for the morrow will be anxious for itself. Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof.

27. Τίς δὲ ἐξ ὑμῶν μεριμνῶν δύναται προσθεῖναι ἐπὶ τὴν ἡλικίαν αὐτοῦ πῆχυν ἓνα;

28. Καὶ περὶ ἐνδύματος τί μεριμνᾶτε; καταμάθετε τὰ κρίνα τοῦ ἀγροῦ πῶς αὐξάνουσιν· οὐ κοπιοῦσιν οὐδὲ νήθουσιν·

29. Λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ὅτι· οὐδὲ Σολομὼν ἐν πάσῃ τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ περιεβάλετο ὡς ἓν τούτων.

30. Εἰ δὲ τὸν χόρτον τοῦ ἀγροῦ σήμερον ὄντα καὶ αὔριον εἰς κλίβανον βαλλόμενον ὁ Θεὸς οὕτως ἀμφιένυσιν, οὐ πολλῶ ὑμᾶς, ὀλιγόπιστοι;

31. Μὴ οὖν μεριμνήσητε λέγοντες· τί φάγωμεν ἢ τί περιβαλώμεθα;

32. Πάντα γὰρ ταῦτα τὰ ἔθνη ἐπιζητοῦσιν· οἶδεν γὰρ ὁ Πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος ὅτι χρήζετε τούτων ἀπάντων.

33. Ζητεῖτε δὲ πρῶτον τὴν δικαιοσύνην καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ καὶ ταῦτα πάντα προστεθήσεται ὑμῖν.

34. Μὴ οὖν μεριμνήσητε εἰς τὴν αὔριον· ἡ γὰρ αὔριον μεριμνήσει ἑαυτῆς· ἀρκετὸν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἡ κακία αὐτῆς.

Many Greek codices, the Peshitto and Syro-hexaplar Syriac, and some other authorities insert the clause *ἢ τι πίνητε*, and what ye shall drink, in the twenty-fifth verse. More are against it, among whom the Sinaitic Codex and Tischendorf. It is admitted into the protestant translations, but remains a doubtful reading. In the thirty-second verse, it is certain that the Vulgate has omitted the term *οὐράνιος*, heavenly, qualifying the *Πατήρ*, which all the Greek codices support.

In Verse thirty-three, the codices B and **N** read as follows: *ζητείτε δὲ πρῶτον τὴν δικαιοσύνην καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτου κτλ.*, “seek ye first his righteousness and his kingdom,” etc. This is endorsed by Eusebius, Tischendorf, Westcott, and Hort, and is undoubtedly the true reading. The codices E, G, K, L, M, S, U, Δ, Π, add *τοῦ Θεοῦ*, which is also found in the Syriac versions, and in some of the Fathers. It was very probably inserted there in an effort to give greater clearness to the passage.

In Verse thirty-four, codices E, K, M, U, Π, have *τὰ ἐαυτῆς*, the things of itself.

In this passage, the Lord first lays down a leading proposition, and then proceeds to maintain it by divers arguments. The proposition is: “Be not solicitous for your life, what ye shall eat, nor for your body, what you shall put on.” Life here means the natural life of man, which needs meat and drink for its sustenance. The two great natural needs of man are food and raiment. These are the universal incentives to labor, and the Saviour intends here to moderate the Christian’s pursuit of these.

The term here employed to designate the act forbidden by Christ is *μεριμνάω*. In the New Testament, this term is taken to signify that anxious care and study which is given to the great aim in life. It signifies that which occupies the thoughts, and whose motive power influences the general course of life. Now in Christ’s teaching, that which occupies our thought and which influences our lives should not be an anxious solicitude for what we shall eat, or what we shall put on. The Lord’s argument is *a fortiori*. Food and raiment are the most necessary temporal goods, and if man be restrained from solicitude for these, *a fortiori* the restraint will apply to other worldly objects.

There is a nexus between this doctrine and the foregoing. The solicitude in this passage corresponds to the serving of Mammon, in the preceding verse. Lest it might come into the mind of man to think that the conditions of human life were such that he must serve Mammon to live, the Lord confirms his former statement by the present argument. The fundamental reason assigned to prove that man should not be solicitous for the necessities of life is that the Providence of God is pledged to care for man. The first argument to prove this proceeds as follows.

The principle of life itself is greater than the food which sustains it, and the body is greater than the raiment which warms it. God gave the principle of life and the body, and therefore he will provide for their needs. The leading truth in the entire passage is that there is a divine Providence ruling in human affairs, which is able to provide for man's wants. The next argument is based on the same principle. Among all the creatures of the animal kingdom of nature, none show greater freedom from toil and care than the birds of the air. They fly about in an unbounded freedom under the broad expanse of heaven, with the whole boundless air as their domain. They seem to spurn the earth for their purer element. They provide nothing, hoard nothing. When they are hungry they fly to food, and fly away again. And the general providence of God provides that they have food. The love which God has for these creatures cannot be compared to that which he has for man. He made them and all other things in this world for man. He is only the Creator of these; he is the Father of man. He gave to man his own image and likeness; he gave him an immortal soul capable of immortality, capable of knowing and loving God himself. Nay more, the Word became incarnate for man. Certainly therefore that Providence which provides for the birds of the air that have no power to know or love God, that die and are no more, will provide for the being which he has raised to such a dignity, and for whom he has done so much.

But man might say: The argument does not conclude; it is true that the birds give no labor to provide food, and yet are fed, but the universe presents another face to man. It has

been cursed for man, and his sentence passed in Eden: "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat thy bread, till thou return unto the ground."—Gen. III. 19. And Paul says to the Thesalonians, II. III. 10; "For verily when we were with you, this we commanded you, that if any man would not work neither should he eat." Paul, though called by God to be an instrument of salvation to the Gentiles, labored by night with his hands that he might have bread.

In response to these things, let a man know that the end of Christ's present teaching is not to relieve man from labor, or from due provision for the future. A perverse sense of these words invaded a certain monastic body in the days of St. Augustine. They held themselves by these words to be exempt from all labor, and they devoted themselves to prayer only. Hence they were called *Euchitæ* from *εὐχή* a prayer. Against them St. Augustine wrote his work "*De Opere Monachorum.*" What the Lord wishes to eliminate from human life is not labor and providence, but that anxious solicitude which distrusts God's providence, and claims such an undue portion of man's thoughts that man becomes enslaved to it, and not free to contemplate, or achieve any high and good work. Man's cheerful labor and thrift, coupled with the providence of God, will support a man without that excessive care and fearful apprehension which invade many minds. God will do this in the manner which he shall elect. Not always by direct miracles, but working unobservedly through second causes. God's providence is not pledged to give us riches and luxury, nor to supply the deficit which wasteful modes of living cause. In this materialistic age, we are so far removed from the mode of life contemplated by Christ for his followers, that his doctrine seems almost impossible. Verily, it is irreconcilable with modern theories, and the more we conform to the worldly way of thinking and living, the harder will it be to receive Christ's doctrine, and do it. God's providence works in such wonderful ways that, even while receiving its benefits, we are prone to be oblivious of the source whence they come.

The twenty-seventh verse has given rise to many different opinions. The general plan of Christ's argument demands that the act here spoken of be a little thing compared to some-

thing greater. In Luke, XII. 25, the same sentence is found, and the Lord calls it a little thing: "If ye then be not able to do that which is least, why are ye anxious for the rest?"

The cubit is a measure of length corresponding to the length of the forearm of a man. The measure was thus not based upon a fixed standard, and consequently varied among different peoples. The Egyptian royal cubit was 20.62 + inches. This is sufficiently evidenced by the nilometer at Elephantine, by measurements of the great pyramid, by many cubit rods, and by measurements given in papyri and elsewhere. This ancient cubit rod seems to have been equal to a Hebrew cubit and a handbreadth. In Ezekiel, XLIII. 13, we read: "And these are the measures of the altar by cubits (cubit rods): the cubit is a cubit and a handbreadth."

The Hebrew cubit consisted of twenty-four digits, or six handbreadth, or two spans. If the cubit rod of the ancient world was seven handbreadths, and was equal to 20.62 + inches then the Hebrew cubit will be 17.679 + inches. With some variation in the decimal this number has been accepted by many archæologists. Colonel Warren assigns a length of 21 inches to the Hebrew cubit; while Captain Conder makes its length 16 inches. Now it seems incongruous that Christ should designate the addition of such a measure to a man's stature as a little thing. And we must bear in mind that the whole force and cogency of the illustration fail, if the concept of the relative littleness of the act be not prominently brought out. If he had said: "Who can, by being solicitous, add the millionth part of an inch to his stature?" we, at once, could have seen the force of the illustration. Forced by these considerations, some seek strange meanings for the terms of the sacred text.

The Greek term which is rendered in English by stature is *ἡλικία*. The classical and Scriptural sense of the term is the stature of the body. It may also mean the period of life when the body attains its full growth. Thus it is used in John, IX. 21, 23: "—he is of age, *ἡλικίαν ἔχει*, ask him." [Cfr. Eph. IV. 13.] In Hebrews, XI. 11, it is used simply of a person's time of life.

Knabenbauer interprets *ἡλικία* in the present passage to mean the duration of life. He cites in support of such opinion Arnoldi, Schegg, Reischl, Schanz, Fillion, Keil, and others. According to this opinion, the meaning would be that no man can add a cubit to the duration of his life. They imagine human life as likened by the Lord to an entity having extension. Now a cubit would be a very small unit in comparison to what we naturally call up in our minds as the lineal extension of a full human life. The aim is always to justify the force of Christ's argument by the relative smallness of the act specified by him.

This opinion is entirely modern. To defend it, they give to *πῆχυς* a strange unheard of meaning. As a precedent, they allege the expression *πήχυις χρόνος*, found in one of the fragments of Mimnermus, an elegiac poet of Greece, contemporary of Solon. But this isolated example can not form a precedent for their interpretation. Granting its genuineness, it occurs in an elegiac poet, who is allowed to use words in strange, unusual senses. It seems highly improbable that Luke who wrote his Gospel in the original Greek, would employ a term in a popular discourse of Christ, in a sense unknown in prose Greek, and rare and exceptional in poetic Greek, in the present sentence where ambiguity would inevitably result, and where it would require the researches of such a linguist as Lobeck to find a rare instance in some old Greek poet. The term *πῆχυς* was a word of daily use in the life of the Greek people, and the popular mind would inevitably refer it here to a measure of the stature of the body. Moreover we believe that the *πῆχυς* is a translation of the term *קֶמַח* used by Christ. Now the use of this term for a measure of duration is absolutely unknown. We believe therefore that we must refer Christ's words to the stature of the human body.

To justify his use of a measure of such length in such an illustration, we believe that the entity at which he aimed was not the size of the measure, but the impossibility of making any addition to our stature. The cubit was chosen inasmuch as it was a well-known measure. No thought was given to its exact extension, since the object on which he wished the human

mind to rest was not the length of the measure, but the inability of man to add anything to his height. The selection of a measure was a merely indifferent thing. Christ is not denying to man a degree of such power corresponding to this definite measure. Man can not add a cubit, nor the millionth part of a hair's breadth to his stature. The word cubit might be suppressed in the words of Christ, and not detract from their message. The substance is this: "Who of you by being solicitous can add aught to his stature?" The selection of any measure of the human body, whose addition would not destroy the proportions of the human body, sufficed to illustrate the truth by a concrete instance. In fact, it seems that the selection of the cubit was especially forcible. It led the mind readily to the main truth that a man can not increase his height, and it easily gave rise to this reflection: Verily not a cubit, nor even a part of the estimation of a hair can I add to my stature. The force of the words is intensified by the thought that the limitations of man's power over his being are greater than the words of Christ express.

Christ calls such addition a little thing, compared to the life of man with its tremendous interests. It is not of vital importance to man whether he be a little taller or a little shorter. Neither in the judgment of the world nor in the judgment of God, is man's place in the scale of being fixed by his stature. Now Christ dissuades from anxious worldly solicitude by pointing out its futility. If man turns away from God man can do nothing to improve his condition. He has no power over the physiological laws that govern his being. Man can neither change his stature, nor escape suffering and death. He is moved on by the awful, inevitable course of nature, and can win nothing good for his real being. Christ therefore discourages anxious care for created things by the thought of their insufficiency to better the estate of man. To add a cubit to man's stature would be a slight thing compared to liberation from death. The illustration used by Christ is apt to bring to man's consciousness how helpless man is to change the inevitable course of nature. By the laws of his being, man's perfection can only come from God, and man wastes his life in trying to secure good contrary to the will of God. And the

Lord argues *a fortiori* that man cannot effect that greater work, inasmuch as he can not produce a less effect. By being solicitous for the things that are eternal, man can essentially better his estate; he can raise himself to a higher degree of eternal glory.

Some form of *μεριμνάω* is used throughout to express the condition of human life in which an undue amount of thought and energy is bestowed on worldly issues.

In pointing out the inability of man to add aught to his stature, Jesus has in mind to teach man the proper order between the action of man and divine Providence. The sphere of man's activity is circumscribed. He is sent into this world by a higher power, and he is maintained in his being by that higher power. The greatest error of man's life is to become oblivious of his dependence on God's power. Now the only really great effects that man can achieve must be by working with the great Cause which gave him being. Activity in this line includes an absolute trust in God, and is not condemned in the present discourse of the Lord. But when a man becomes oblivious of God, and endeavors by the force of anxious thought and effort to make himself something great, independently of God, the Saviour's words apply. Let man bestow all the frantic effort of which human nature is capable on the enterprise; let him give thought and labor by day and by night to the issue; and what can he accomplish? If he succeeds, it is because the providence of God has included his unworthy self in its beneficent economy. Man sins daily by attributing to himself the effect which a benign Providence works for him.

Man is not sent into the world to battle as best he may with the blind forces of nature. A particular Providence follows every man. If God gave man over to provide for himself, human life would soon end. Man is unable to live his life on earth, without the providential care of God. Christ's words tend to impress on man man's need and the source of his help.

Again, the words of Christ represent worldly achievement in its just proportions. Let a man give every resource of his being to the acquisition of temporal goods; let him succeed; let him have boundless wealth in all its forms; and has he added a

cubit to his stature? Has he added anything to the real value of his life? No. He has invested himself with a certain number of accidental appendages; and at death they take him out of these, and bury him away from the sight of men. He has spent his life in going after vanities; and at its end he finds himself unfurnished with any thing of value. The inevitable results of every life that spends its energies in the pursuit of these vain objects is a failure.

The effect which the words of Christ should have upon us is to make us move serenely in our course of life, doing the things that our hands find to do, and "casting all our care upon God; for he careth for us." This will temper that devouring worry and care, which hardens the nature of man and stifles all nobler impulses. It will not stop human progress, nor make man's life listless and aimless; but it will put a serene order in it, and direct human energy to something worthy of the high nature of man.

The next illustration regards man's raiment. Some have thought that the term *κρίνον* is used here in a generic sense to mean any wild flower. Such interpretation is unwarranted, and weakens the force of the illustration. The lily was styled by the ancients the *ἄνθος κατ' ἐξοχήν*. What can compare to the purity of its whiteness? To make his words more forcible, the Lord takes for example the wild lily of the field. Upon it no care of man has ever been bestowed. Being an insensate creature, it bestowed no labor on its beauty. It grew, and unfolded its white petals by the power of God working through nature. It is not a product of chance. It reveals a divine idea, which gave it its beauty. It is a product of the eternal ideas of God, and of the providence of God, which preserves its being. It is of little worth compared to man. It is but the creature of a day. It blossoms, fades, and dies, and is no more. It withers on its stalk, and men collect its dried stalk, and make of it a fire to cook food. Men will certainly admit that the providence of God includes that passing flower; and if so, will it be oblivious of the being for whom the flower was created? The Lord makes nature speak and tell man of God and his attributes.

How these words assure us of an all-ruling Providence which watches over us? What safety we feel in the protecting care of that Almighty power!

The splendor of Solomon's state was never surpassed by mortal man. When the Queen of Sheba came to visit him, witnessing his splendor, "there was no more spirit in her." In the providence of God this earthly splendor was permitted as a type of the glory of the Messiah. On the minds of the Jews the memory of that reign was deeply impressed, and with that splendor they associated the Messiah. Great was the disappointment when the son of an artisan came in the Messiah's name.

The message of Christ in all its fullness contemplates sanctity as the state of man. The application of Christ's law to the life of man will be possible in the measure in which man has entered into the state of sanctity. But even to the man in the lowest degree of the Christian life Christ's words are applicable. They establish for man the divine certainty that he should take account of a loving Providence in his thought and labor for the maintenance of his life. God may not send a raven to bring him a daily portion of bread; God may not exempt him from hunger and suffering; God may allow him and those he loves to perish with hunger; but not even then is God to be less trusted. Doubtless, in the history of the world, many Christians who believed and trusted in the Lord died of hunger and exposure, but not one of them was abandoned by an ever-watchful Providence. These sufferings were permitted by God in his mysterious ways to perfect and sanctify those souls. It is a mere mercenary trust to hold to God when the mouth is filled with bread, and leave him when we are hungry. The providence of God was close to Job when he was rotting in the ashes.

The high import of the present passage establishes a great truth, and calls for a corresponding disposition of soul. The great truth is that man is held by God in great value, and that he is kept by God in a tender fatherly keeping. The Heavenly Father knows the needs of all his creatures, and provides for them, not scantily but bountifully. God knows man's needs

better than man knows them himself. God comes intimately into human life, not as a cold stern being of power, but a loving Father.

Our vision is limited, we see only our present life and its needs; God's vision is infinite, and he sees man's present and his future, and the proportions and relations between these two states of life. There are needs in that awful future life to promote which God must sacrifice the advantages and comforts of the present life of man. Can God be said to have withdrawn himself from us, when he withholds earthly benefits that he may thereby insure to us eternal things?

God tries our faith by seeming to stand aloof in our afflictions. But no man is fit for Heaven who has not been tried. True faith does not covet comforts; it does not bargain with God to serve him pleasantly. The true Christian is not a coward fleeing before the face of pain, and longing for the flesh-pots of Egypt, if he chance to be hungry in the desert. Hence the disposition of soul that these words should generate is an absolute trust that God careth for us in all things. We should repose on that trust, not a repose that engenders unthriftiness and improvidence, but a repose which brings God into human thought and labor as an ever present reality.

Some give themselves up to anxious care, as though they were thrown on their own resources, and there were no God in the universe. This is an evidence of that weak faith which the Lord reproves. The Christian should formulate the plan of his life upon the basis that God is ever present, and ever mindful of man's needs, even though he work no miracles to prove such truth. God asks of man faith, and diligence in the duties of his state of life. If these are given in just measure, God will do the rest. If, notwithstanding that these are given by the Christian, he finds himself unprovided with the necessities of life, let him take it as an indication that God wishes to purify him by suffering; and let him trust on, and if God take the lives of those he loves, even before his eyes, let him say: "Thy will be done." Whenever man is unfed, or unclothed, or houseless, it is not because God is not what Christ here represents him to be. It is because we have repelled him by the weakness

of our faith or by the sinfulness of our lives, or because God is leading us through the hard path of trial and suffering to the real good.

But how few are satisfied with the portion of earth's goods which suffices for the needs of our life? They wish for luxuries and comforts. It would be irony, if God gave his beloved riches, and then said: "Blessed are the poor." When our hearts grow cold and earthly, God seems to us to be in nothing concerned with man's life, but this erroneous judgment is based on our defective subjective state.

These words of Christ apply to all the ranks and conditions of life in proper degree. They apply to the man whose duty it is to toil for the daily bread for himself and family: they apply to the professional man, the man of business, and the religious. They are the warrant of the man who renounces every visible means of support, and throws himself on the providence of God. So did the Apostles, and God maintained Christ's promise. Christ's martyrs suffered, and were put to death, not because God was oblivious of them, but because he had elected that they should drink the chalice that the Redeemer had drunk.

To move his followers to live his teachings, the Lord instances the manner of life of the heathens. It was before the light had gone out to the nations of the earth, and the term of the comparison was just. The great Gentile world was enveloped in ignorance, and the gods they worshipped had given them no law of life. They knew not the existence of a divine Providence. Now it would be a great shame to the Christian if he, with his clear knowledge, should order his life as they did. The Lord supposes that Christian life shall not consist in a sterile acceptance of a system of truths, but that it shall be a living reality, in which faith is an intense motive power impressing a character upon thought, word and deed. A man should ask himself: Whence have the acts of my life their character? If he can truthfully say: From my faith, it is well with him.

In the thirty-third verse the Lord draws the consequences from the entire argument. Following the order of the Vatican

Codex, the interpretation is plain: "Seek ye first the righteousness of God and his kingdom, and all these things shall be added to you." The righteousness of God is the state of the soul which is united to God, and informed by God's sanctifying grace. It is the product of man's co-operation with the grace of God. It incorporates a man as a living member in the great kingdom of God, gives him fellowship with the Church in Heaven, and places his soul under the influence of those divine forces that operate through the organized body of the Church on earth. Hence the two terms are joined here, and righteousness is placed as a condition for entrance into that great creation of God. Now righteousness should be the soul's first aim. It should be the supreme end of all man's thoughts, and of all man's labor. When that supreme aim is held high above every other interest, and the man moves resolutely to its attainment, God is pledged for the result. The right order of life is established, and God will act with man to provide what he needs. The number of such souls is not large in the world, and yet a representation of them is always found in the Church. And God's providence tenderly watches over them, and they will tell you that in strange and wonderful ways they have received the effects of a bountiful Providence. And God tries them at times, lest there might be danger that they serve God only in the hope of the good things of earth. But the proper disposition of the soul which has the testimony of conscience that it is what God wills it to be, is an absolute trust, that establishes serenity and peace in the soul, and makes labor reposeful.

In looking at the condition of the world, one would think that no such message was ever delivered to man. There is much activity, and much thought, and keen calculation and weighing of issues, but how little of it is for God? The portion of God is little, and Mammon's part is great. In many lives there is no conflict of interests, because God is not represented in such lives; but even in the lives of believers, in the conflict of the opposite interests, how rarely it is that God's righteousness and his kingdom are first, and other things held in second place? The world supplants Christ, and says: "Seek first success and possessions, and give to religion that portion of your leisure which shall be comfortable."

The kingdom of God in this passage should be interpreted in the manner explained in the Lord's prayer.

The thirty-fourth verse contains a philosophic argument against borrowing trouble. The science of Christian life and the science of right philosophy are in perfect accord. Hence the Lord avails himself of a philosophical reflection to corroborate his present position. The perfect Christian life will consist in a harmonious adjustment of all issues; hence it will be religious and philosophical. The reasoning of the thirty-fourth verse would be true and valuable to human life, even if man had never been redeemed, or if man's life were its own end. But yet its import is greater in the light of the message of Christ.

The perfect law of man should teach man how to live. It should teach how and what to believe; how to control instincts and desires; and how to order the daily actions of life. To perform that high function, the perfect law taught by Christ rightly makes use of natural truths in their proper sphere of bearing upon human life. Over and above being a distrust of God, anxiety and trouble of mind for the morrow is a sin against philosophy. To provide in season for future needs is a moral virtue. This is commanded in Scripture. Joseph did thus in Egypt; and Solomon advises man to take a lesson from the ant: "Go to the ant, thou sluggard; consider her ways and be wise; which having no guide, overseer, or ruler, provideth her meat in the summer, and gathereth her food in the harvest." —Prov. VI. 6—8. [Cfr. XXX. 25.]

The lack of the virtue of providence is one of the lamentable defects of our proletariat. It conduces not to religion, but to degrading indigency, moral irresponsibility, and ignorance. It is wise and religious to take thought for the morrow, but thought and labor should be immune from that devouring, distrustful anxiety, which preoccupies the mind, and excludes the service of God. The philosophical reason for this is that such anxious solicitude doubles the trouble, and misery, and care of the future day, without in any wise bettering the future. Present labor, wise and prudent thought and calculation will ward off trouble, and lessen the morrow's load of care. But that state of mind which the Lord expresses by the *μεριμνάω*

simply reaches forward into the future, and transfers into our present life by anticipation evils both real and imaginary, and makes us suffer the real one twice, and the imagined ones needlessly: and all this to no purpose; for by its very nature, it is inefficacious to change the coming events.

The Lord shows his love for man in teaching him this right philosophy of life. But in addition to the natural distress occasioned by this state of mind, there is a greater evil in its effect on the religious element in man. When that excessive anxious care invades the life of man, it preoccupies him, and renders his state like that of Hamlet, Prince of Denmark. It becomes a sort of mental disease, and unfits the man for healthy thought and action. The whole man is in a state of unnatural tension, and man loses interest in everything that has not a direct bearing on the chief object of his thoughts. In such a state, the right service of God is an impossibility. The fever of unrest has unbalanced the man, and worldly preoccupation banishes religious calm and religious thought.

Every day has its duties to be done, and every day has its sufferings to be borne. Healthy labor, and proper forethought exclude not the service of God, and are not condemned. The Lord holds the pulse of humanity, and prescribes a sure remedy for the great malady of the world.

The bad effects of brooding over future evils cannot be adequately estimated. Such course of thought makes the mind a blank as regards religious issues. It leads to irritability, sullen despair, and even to suicide. When a man so loves the goods of this world, that fear that he may lose them thus preys on his mind he is serving Mammon.

MATT. VII. 1—6.

1. Μὴ κρίνετε ἵνα μὴ κριθῆτε.
2. Ἐν ᾧ γὰρ κρίματι κρίνετε κριθήσεσθε καὶ ἐν ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν.

LUKE VI. 37—42.

37. Καὶ μὴ κρίνετε, καὶ οὐ μὴ κριθῆτε: καὶ μὴ δικάζετε, καὶ οὐ μὴ δικάσθητε: ἀπολύετε καὶ ἀπολυθήσεσθε.
38. Δίδετε, καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν: μέτρον καλὸν, πεπισμένον, σεσαλευμένον, ὑπερεκχυνόμενον δώσουσιν εἰς τὸν κόλπον ὑμῶν, ᾧ γὰρ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε, (ἀντί) μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν.

3. Τὶ δὲ βλέπεις τὸ κάρφος τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου, τὴν δὲ ἐν τῷ σῷ ὀφθαλμῷ δοκὸν οὐ κατανοεῖς;

4. Ἡ πῶς ἐρεῖς τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου: ἄφες ἐκβάλω τὸ κάρφος ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ σου, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἡ δοκὸς ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ σου.

5. Ὑποκριτά, ἔκβαλε πρῶτον ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ σου τὴν δοκόν, καὶ τότε διαβλέψεις ἐκβαλεῖν τὸ κάρφος ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου.

6. Μὴ δώτε τὸ ἅγιον τοῖς κυσίν, μηδὲ βάλετε τοὺς μαργαρίτας ὑμῶν ἔμπροσθεν τῶν χοίρων, μήποτε καταπατήσουσιν αὐτοὺς ἐν τοῖς ποσίν αὐτῶν καὶ στραφέντες ρήξωσιν ὑμᾶς.

1. Judge not, that ye be not judged.

2. For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged: and with what measure ye measure, it shall be measured unto you.

39. Εἶπεν δὲ καὶ παραβολὴν αὐτοῖς: Μήτι δύνатаι τυφλὸς τυφλὸν ὁδηγεῖν; οὐχὶ ἀμφοτέροισιν εἰς βόθυνον ἐμπεσοῦνται;

40. Οὐκ ἔστιν μαθητὴς ὑπὲρ τὸν διδάσκαλον: κατηρτισμένος δὲ πᾶς ἔσται ὡς ὁ διδάσκαλος αὐτοῦ.

41. Τὶ δὲ βλέπεις τὸ κάρφος τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου, τὴν δὲ δοκὸν τὴν ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ ὀφθαλμῷ οὐ κατανοεῖς;

42. Πῶς δύνασαι λέγειν τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου: Ἀδελφέ, ἄφες ἐκβάλω τὸ κάρφος τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ σου, αὐτὸς τὴν ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ σου δοκὸν οὐ βλέπων; ὑποκριτά, ἔκβαλε πρῶτον τὴν δοκὸν ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ σου, καὶ τότε διαβλέψεις τὸ κάρφος τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου ἐκβαλεῖν.

37. And judge not, and ye shall not be judged: and condemn not, and ye shall not be condemned: release, and ye shall be released.

38. Give, and it shall be given unto you; good measure, pressed down, shaken together, running over, shall they give into your bosom. For with what measure ye mete it shall be measured to you again.

39. And he spoke also a parable unto them: Can the

3. And why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye?

4. Or how wilt thou say to thy brother: Let me cast out the mote out of thine eye; and lo, the beam is in thine own eye?

5. Thou hypocrite, cast out first the beam out of thine own eye; and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye.

6. Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast your pearls before the swine, lest haply they trample them under their feet, and turn and rend you.

blind guide the blind? shall they not both fall into a pit?

40. The disciple is not above his master: but every one when he is perfected shall be as his master.

41. And why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye?

42. Or how canst thou say to thy brother: Brother, let me cast out the mote that is in thine eye, when thou thyself beholdest not the beam that is in thine own eye? Thou hypocrite, cast out first the beam out of thine own eye, and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote that is in thy brother's eye.

With the exception of the sixth verse of Matthew, the passage of Luke contains the substantial truths of Matthew's narrative, in greater fullness, and supplies some important elements omitted by Matthew. We shall therefore treat the account of Luke as the basis of the Commentary, and add to it the explanation of the sixth verse of Matthew.

Human nature has a determined proclivity to pass censorious judgment on the human acts of men. Men are prone to put the worst construction on the doubtful actions of their fellow men, and to condemn a man according to their own standard of judgment. This is forbidden by God for many reasons. First, man is incapable of judging truthfully of the deeds of his neighbor. To judge of human acts, the judge must know the motives that moved the action; these are in the

heart of man, and often are not manifest to any one save God. Therefore does Paul say: "Therefore judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come, who will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of hearts, and then shall every man have his praise from God."—I. Cor. IV. 5.

The difficulty of judging a man was recently illustrated by the following incident. A man high in favor with Pope Leo XIII., through certain questions of Church policy fell from the Pope's favor. The venerable pontiff was so far changed towards him that he considered him a dangerous man, a man to be avoided, a man whose opinions might lead others astray. Now the man thus out of favor had formerly occupied a post of importance. He had several under him, and one of these, one whom he had especially favored and befriended, was chosen to succeed him. The man thus appointed in place of the other waited on Pope Leo XIII. and in that interview was cautioned against any association, social or official, with his former superior and friend. Vital interest moved him to accept the post; he could not disobey the Pope, who was acting according to his conscience. He feared to tell his friend the Pope's command, as it seemed to be given privately, and also he feared the moral effect which such knowledge might cause. There was but one thing to do, avoid his former friend, exclude him from everything, refuse him recognition, cut off all visits to their common friends, and wait until the misunderstanding was cleared up. And in the mercy of God it was cleared up, and that same man received from Pope Leo XIII. the exhortation to cultivate the friendship of the man whom he was for a season compelled to avoid. What were the thoughts of the man thus cruelly treated? Did he judge his younger friend base, ungrateful, time-serving? This is known to God, but certainly this page of history related to the writer by one of the chief actors proves the impossibility of judging our fellow men.

Moreover by judging a man, we arrogate to ourselves a power which God by right claims for himself. As this is an important precept in the moral life of man, it is good to fix as far as we may the specific act here condemned by Christ.

Certainly the Lord refers not to forensic judgments passed upon persons by the proper authority. Neither does the Lord bid us refuse to accept the evidence of clearly proven facts. In such case, we do not judge the man, but the evidence of his deeds condemns him.

We must note here that the additional proposition used by Luke: "Condemn not, and ye shall not be condemned," is only explanatory of the preceding concept. To judge and to condemn are of synonymous import, and the use of the second term brings out in greater relief the act of judging which is forbidden. That which is here forbidden by Christ is that hard, censorious quality of the mind which proceeds straightway to pass sentence of condemnation upon the doubtful issues of our neighbor's conduct. If the issue is evident, it does not need our judgment, but the case contemplated by Christ is where some human act exists, which is in appearance bad, and which is involved in a certain element of uncertainty. The greater number of human acts are of this nature. It is forbidden by Christ to a man to pass unfavorable sentence on such act. To judge thus is rash, arrogant, and uncharitable. It betokens the man of little mind, and of harsh, unfeeling temper. The man of large, finely tempered mind is always deeply conscious of the limitations of his intellect and of his own infirmities. The smaller a man's mind is, the more ready will he be to pass ready judgment on all matters, and to be puffed up with his own ideas. To pass ready judgment on the deeds of men evidences the mind of a man who always stays on the surface of things, lacking the depth to see through the deeds of men; of one who measures the universe by the small measure of it that is in his puny mind. It is a sorely disgusting sight when such a being usurps the prerogative of judge of men.

The Lord's words refer chiefly to the passing of judgment upon the acts of individuals. But the defect of judgment is not restricted to this alone. It consists also in that proclivity to pass judgment on questions of political economy, of Church polity, on questions regarding the duties and obligations of rulers in Church and state, on the philosophy of history, and other matters of great moment. This is a striking characteristic of our age; it is a sin against wisdom, and against God. In

the true man, self-possession takes the place of self-conceit, introspection the place of pedantry, and charity the place of censorious judgment.

Even when the evidence of facts, or the process of the law, condemns a man, charity should be displayed in our attitude towards the guilty man. We should not speak of his fall gloatingly, exultingly, but regretfully, and while we endorse society's right to protect itself, we should feel that there are elements in the affair which only God can judge, and a feeling of pity and sympathy should mingle with the sternness of justice.

Even the judge in the tribunal of man, in the actual passing of the sentence, should forbear to judge in the sense here meant. The judgment here indicated means the fixing of the degree of malice of a human act. Now that degree is known only to God. Society has a right to proceed on the evidence of facts, and pass judgment, but the judgment does not essay to fix the man's state in the forum of God. The judge in the courts of man should feel deeply conscious of this. It should be a strong characteristic of every Christian. It applies to every rank in life. It is one of the leading qualities of the religious man. It applies to the little deeds and to the great deeds of our neighbor's conduct. It is an evidence of that refinement of soul of the man perfected by the ennobling power of the doctrine of Christ. This is the true culture which despises the low vulgarity of temerarious judgments as something unworthy of a refined spirit. The man who takes from the spirit of these words the directing law of his life, will be aided by the spirit of God to make its right application to the individual acts of his life.

To move man to maintain this high law, Christ announces to him its great consequences in God's judgment of man.

Verily Christ does not mean that any man shall escape God's judgment. God will judge every man, but Christ means by his words that the tenor of man's dealings with his fellow man will establish the tenor of God's retribution.

A duty cognate to that of forbearance in judgment is that of forgiveness of injuries, which has been fully treated in the commentary on the Lord's prayer.

The thirty-eighth verse of Luke is one of the finest texts in the holy Scriptures to declare the bounty of God in rewarding acts of charity and mercy. The metaphor is taken from the measuring of the corn. Four degrees of the fullness of a measure of wheat are mentioned. The first is the good measure, when the bushel is well filled up to the brim. By pressing down the grain with the hands the interstices between the kernels are narrowed, and more grain may be put on. Then by shaking the bushel the mass becomes still more compressed, allowing of further addition of corn. There is but one way left to increase its capacity, to heap the grain upon the bushel till it runs over. Such is the measure with which God measures out the reward to the elect for their merits. Christ applies it here to the theme of which he is treating, inasmuch as that virtue is especially pleasing to God, and must be found in every one of the elect. Large and certain wages are an inducement to faithful labor in the fields of human labor. Why should they be less so in the harvest field of God?

Insistence on the material words might find a difficulty in the fact that, after declaring such bountiful mode of dealing of God towards us, he says at the same time that it shall be measured to us in the same measure that we measure to others. We must know therefore that the parity existing between our dealings with man and God's dealings with us is not of degree but of general tenor. Paul gives the key to the situation: "He who soweth sparingly shall reap also sparingly; and he who soweth bountifully shall reap also bountifully."—II. Cor. IX. 6. If we have been hard, and unforgiving, and close with our neighbors, it shall be taken into account in the judgment of God upon our lives. For God, though all powerful, can not *make* the judgment of our lives. We make that judgment; we are writing it every day, and God must pass sentence in truth according to the tenor of our lives. So that the man who has shut up his heart from his fellow man, can not receive the bounteous measure of God. But to the generous giver and faithful servant the full measure is given. For the charity and mercy of the creature is rewarded by a corresponding tenor in God's action, which, in its infinite mode of being, infinitely

transcends the nature of the creature's act. A proportion of analogy exists between act and act, while the modes of being of the two acts are infinitely disparate.

It is vain to object that the comparison is defective, for the reason that, according to its wording, God must needs judge us rashly and unjustly, if we shall have thus judged men. The words of Christ truly make the tenor of our judgments of men the measure of God's judgment of us, but the obvious sense of the words clearly declares that the comparison only holds as regards the severity of the two judgments. Mercy shall encompass the man who has shown mercy; and judgment without mercy to him who has not shown mercy.

The thirty-ninth verse of St. Luke has a parallel in Matthew, but not in the present context. It is found in Matthew XI. 14.

The Lord continually illustrates his doctrine by contrasting it with the tenets and practices of the Pharisees. The social organization of the world in those days was such that men followed teachers in everything. Christ recognized this, and made use of that means to teach the world. He was met at the outset by a difficulty. The people were addicted to the Pharisees, and these hypocrites alienated the people from Christ. Now for the Pharisees Christ was to substitute the apostolic body. But the new teachers were to be warned against the qualities which made the Pharisees a curse to Israel. Therefore to the multitude assembled Christ taught both what the present teachers were, and what the proper teacher should be. To avail aught, a teacher must be believed and followed. If that teacher leads by the wrong path, his disciples will follow him. To illustrate this the Lord uses a very plain simile. If a blind man leads a blind man, both fall into a pit. If the person led had the use of vision, he could make use of his eyes to save himself from the fall; but when blind, he puts his trust in the guide, and falls with him. The figure only sets forth what the natural effect of such an event would be. God may interpose in some way, and save the follower from the pit, but this would not be due to the action of the guide. All the causality of that leadership naturally tends to lead the follower into danger and ruin. Now the application of this is obvious. The

people were blind in this sense that they gave themselves up to the secular affairs of life, and looked to the priest to stand between God and them, and hand down to them God's law, and teach them how to do it. God himself had ordained such to be the function of the teacher in Israel. "For the priest's lips shall keep knowledge, and they shall seek it at his mouth; for he is the messenger of the Lord of hosts."—Malachi II. 7.

Christ's illustration contains a reproach of the people as well as of their teachers. Though the crime of the Jewish people was not as great as that of their leaders, yet the people also sinned against the light. By the mission of St. John the Baptist, and by Christ's own preaching and wonderful works, sufficient evidence was given to the Jewish people to bring them to accept the Messiah. The people remained blind through willful abuse of the light. The people preferred to follow their false guides, because these false guides flattered their national pride, and pandered to their low ideas of religion. Christ issued a call to spiritual life and to spiritual treasures; and the Jewish people rejected the call because they coveted worldly things. Wilfully therefore closing their eyes to the light they became spiritually blind, and followed their false leaders into that sad ruin that has since come upon that race. God ordained that the people should be led by religious guides, but these are fallible agents, and are not to be obeyed when the clearest evidence shows us that they are traitors to God. God never bade us put an absolute trust in men. He has told us to use the ministry of men, and to honor and obey them; but there is always provision made for the failure of the human agent. We are to trust the Church absolutely, because she can not fail: her infallibility and indefectibility rest not on men, but on God himself. Infallibility is vested in her head in his office of universal teacher; this prerogative was not given to Israel's priesthood. Had the Jewish people therefore corresponded to Christ's graces, they would have turned from their false teachers to accept the Gospel of Jesus Christ. And this is also verified in the case of the heretical sects: the leaders have the greater sin; but the people who follow them are also blameworthy, for there is evidence enough in the world to bring them from error to truth.

The blindness of the Pharisees was a moral blindness consisting in many things. They were inaccessible to the idea of the true nature of religion. Instead of drawing from the Scriptures their true message, they built up a system of mere outward observances, which they especially adapted to their own advantage. They were mere sophists and casuists in a gross and material system of forms and ceremonies.

The Lord's description of the baneful effects of a false teacher was not only delivered in reference to the Pharisees. The Pharisees were pointed out by way of illustration, but the doctrine is a universal message to the world on the effects of bad teaching.

Verse forty is a corroboration of the foregoing verse. The effect of a teacher is to make the disciple like himself in thought and principle. Men who follow a teacher become like him, and accept his principles. Christ illustrated his truths by the conditions of life as he found them. In those days, men would follow a leader, and all representatives of thought had their disciples. Now that at which the disciple aimed was to become like the master. That was his perfection, the point at which he aimed. Therefore the defects of the master were transmitted to the disciple, and hence the evil effect of the false teacher was of the greatest consequence. Christ was about to commit the world to the means of oral teaching to give the world the law of life, and it was well to impress on all the importance of the province of the teacher.

A difficulty exists to find the logical nexus between verses forty-one and forty-two of Luke and the preceding. Endeavoring to establish such nexus, some have interpreted the sense of these two verses to be a qualification of the teacher. In their opinion, he who would reprove vice in others must himself be blameless, must make rigid self-examination a condition for the moderation of another's conduct. This view seems to narrow the passage to the sole specific application to teachers. Now that it is one of the qualifications of a teacher of morality there is no doubt; but from its context in Matthew, and its native sense, it seems to be intended by Christ as a universal canon of Christian conduct. Matthew was an ear-witness of this wonderful discourse, and his account, in the main, is by

far the fuller. There is nothing in Matthew's account that would persuade us that the passage was meant specifically for teachers. The only thing in Luke that favors such a view is the similitude immediately preceding. But we can harmonize Luke with Matthew by taking a broad view of the Saviour's plan. In the entire passage, the Lord teaches a universal truth of Christian conduct, which he illustrates by comparison with the theories and mode of conduct of the Pharisees. In the similitude of Luke, therefore, he brings out in especial clearness the defects of the Pharisees. The broader the grasp of truth in a mind, the more will the religious truths be related. When our Lord taught man, the whole world of moral truth was before him.

Having therefore determined that this passage contains a truth equally applicable to all conditions of human life, we now set about to know its meaning. The Lord by a powerful metaphor makes a religious application of a truth that has always been recognized in the philosophy of human life.

To see in their worst light the deeds of others, and pass unfavorable judgment thereon is the seeing of the mote in the brother's eye. The natural form of the simile illustrates forcibly that habit of mind which exaggerates the defects of others. The term *ἐπιβλέπεις* of the Greek text has a special energy. It conveys the idea of a close, searching scrutiny. We are lynx-eyed in our examinations of another's life; nothing escapes our scrutiny. The least failing is magnified, and condemned. But when it is a question of self-examination, not only are we not lynx-eyed but we do not even advert (*κατανοέω*) to the existence of grave defects, which to the smaller defects observed in the neighbor bear the proportion of a beam to a mote, an atom which floats in the sunbeams.

Philosophers and poets have inveighed against this proclivity of human nature. Horace declares:

"Cum tua pervideas oculis mala lippus inunctis,
Cur in amicorum vitiis tam cernis acutum,
Quam aut aquila aut serpens Epidaurius?

Hor. Sat. I. III. 25.

Seneca says: "Papulas observatis alienas, ipsi obsiti pluribus ulceribus. Hoc tale est, quale, si quis pulcherimorum corporum nævos, aut verrucas derideat quem vera scabies depascitur."—*De Vita Beata*, 27. Thus also Cicero says: "Proprium est stultitiæ aliorum vitia cernere; oblivisci suorum."—*Tusc. Quæst.* III. 30.

It is great hypocrisy to show zeal in wishing to admonish the brother, and to correct his faults, while greater vices infect ourselves, to eradicate which we give no care. Persons thus affected are unfit to exercise fraternal correction. When they have turned their eyes in upon their own soul, and have diagnosed properly its diseases, and have applied effective cures, then will they acquire that temper of mind requisite to deal with the defects of the neighbor.

This is a Protean malady. Its degrees of sinfulness depend on the gravity of the issue at stake, but it is a general tendency that is foolish and disgusting to God. It disposes the mind to all the kindred sins against charity; it engenders pride, self-righteousness, and presumption; and removes the man very far from the true temper of a Christian mind. The defect of self-examination consists not so much in a failure to detect grave and heinous sins, but in a failure to become conscious of defects in our traits of character.

In judging man's life, God takes into account more than mere heinous sin. He must take into account the moral qualities of man's life, its fruits, its general effects on those whom it has influenced. Not alone therefore the sin that we commit or avoid makes us what we are, but all our qualities, traits and characteristics. Now in almost every mortal there is defect in self-examination in regard to these moral qualities, and in few is there that fine consideration for others which is the essence of refined charity. By nature it is easy to detect the defective qualities of others. Crude nature will do this readily, but crude nature does not invite us to self-examination. To do this we must appeal to a high motive, and force ourselves to do a disagreeable duty. Neither will our defects reveal themselves by one mere act of self-examination. Self-examination must be a study, one of the main studies of a man's life. Of course, the study will not cure the disease, but only give

the knowledge of the presence and nature of the disease. Self-discipline must proceed upon this knowledge to cure the moral malady. The discovery therefore of a reprehensible quality in a neighbor or friend should not move us immediately to condemn him, but rather should move us to a rigid examination of self, to know if we have not also similar qualities, which seem so monstrous in others.

There is not a close connection between the sixth verse of Matthew and that which precedes and follows. The discourse contains practical laws of Christian conduct, and that broad basis is the motive of its unification. The verse contains a metaphor in which the knowledge of God and of holy things is called a holy thing. It is called also a pearl, to indicate its pure elevated character and its great worth. Hence we believe that they err who hold that two different entities are signified by the holy thing and the pearl. One and the same entity, namely the holy message of God, is therein signified by the force of the metaphorical sense of the two terms.

In like manner, one class of men is represented by the dogs and the swine. The instincts of both these animals are proverbially low. The dog will readily eat rotting carrion, and the hog is satisfied to eat swill, and roll itself in the mud.

The dogs and swine are those who are immersed in the lusts of the world and of the flesh. Our great poet has said "wisdom to the vile seems vile." This is still more true when applied to the high wisdom of God. To these carnal minded men the holy mysteries of God and his sacraments seem foolish. It is evident that the latter part of the verse applies only to the action of the swine. The hog is a concrete type of stolid sensuality. It has its function in the great universe, and corresponds to the divine idea. To find the qualities of a hog in the animal itself is good; but when the high nature of man descends from its proper plane of being, and becomes like the swine, great is the disappointment of God.

The basis of the metaphor is very true to fact. The great instinct of the hog is to seek food. It has none of the finer traits of the nobler animals. Everything that will not fill its belly is trampled under its feet. The recompense, which it

would be liable to return to the one who threw pearls before it would be to bite him if it were able. The part that the dog plays in the metaphor is less than that of the hog.

Now by this figurative language the Lord instructed his followers how they should bear themselves in treating of the truths of religion with men. It is a precept of universal application, laid down as a practical law of conduct for all his followers. The wise Siracida declares: "Where there is no hearing, pour not out words." The Lord's teaching is to the same purpose, but it is deeper. The teachers of the New Law were commanded to preach the Gospel to every man, and no fear of personal danger, insult, or inconvenience restrained them from fulfilling that mission. But, at the same time, they and all Christians are forbidden to cast the pearls before the swine. The harmony of these two truths is founded on the following considerations. The law of Christ consists of various truths. These can not be presented to a man all at once; he enters gradually into a logical system, which leads him up into the heights. The early Church understood this well, and delivered not the *doctrina arcana* to the catechumens till they were prepared by previous teaching and probation. Now the deeper mysteries are especially signified here under the figure of a holy thing and of pearls. Every man is thereby commanded to refrain from presenting the holy themes of religion to such individuals who would despise and insult them.

There are times and places where to bring in the holy themes of religion would be to no purpose, and where they would only receive scorn and ridicule, and their exponents outrage and insult. The doctrine of the existence of God, the necessity of redemption, repentance, and the power of Christ are themes which may be presented at proper times and under proper conditions to every man. But they are not to be dragged into the gutter, nor presented at such times and places that they serve only as an excitement to sacrilegious insult. And when a man gives evidence that he is not accessible to these great basic truths, the more delicate mysteries are not to be spoken of in his presence. It is a part of the prudence of the serpent not to expose the holy things of the New Law to insult by inopportunately presenting them to carnal minded men.

It would be grave folly to essay to treat of the real presence in the Eucharist, the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, and Mary's intercession, of the doctrine of indulgences, and Extreme Unction to carnal minded, godless, and irreverent men.

Religion is therefore to be presented to every man, but in such a manner that will preserve to it a certain reverence. Prudence must be shown as to fitness of times and places, and judgment must be shown in the mode of presentation to individuals. Such admonition was more important in the early ages of the Church, when the message had to be presented to men who were in complete ignorance of Christ, but it still has value in regulating our attitude towards every man in relation to the mysteries of faith.

MATT. VII. 7—11

LUKE XI. 5—13.

5. Καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς: Τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν ἔξει φίλον, καὶ πορεύσεται πρὸς αὐτὸν μεσονυκτίου, καὶ εἴπῃ αὐτῷ: Φίλε, χρῆσόν μοι τρεῖς ἄρτους:

6. Ἐπειδὴ φίλος μου παρεγένετο ἐξ ὁδοῦ πρὸς με, καὶ οὐκ ἔχω δὲ παραθήσω αὐτῷ.

7. Κάκεινος ἔσωθεν ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπῃ: Μὴ μοι κόπους πάρεχε: ἥδη ἡ θύρα κέκλεισται, καὶ τὰ παιδία μου μετ' ἐμοῦ εἰς τὴν κοίτην εἰσίν: οὐ δύναμαι ἀναστὰς δοῦναί σοι.

8. Λέγω ὑμῖν, εἰ καὶ οὐ δώσει αὐτῷ ἀναστὰς διὰ τὸ εἶναι φίλον αὐτοῦ, διὰ γε τὴν ἀναίδειαν αὐτοῦ ἐγερθεὶς δώσει αὐτῷ ὅσων χρήζει.

7. Αἰτεῖτε καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν, ζητεῖτε καὶ εὕρήσετε, κρούετε καὶ ἀνοιγήσεται ὑμῖν.

9. Κἀγὼ ὑμῖν λέγω: Αἰτεῖτε, καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν, ζητεῖτε, καὶ εὕρήσετε: κρούετε καὶ ἀνοιγήσεται ὑμῖν.

8. Πᾶς γὰρ ὁ αἰτῶν λαμβάνει, καὶ ὁ ζητῶν εὐρίσκει καὶ τῷ χρούοντι ἀνοίγεται.

9. Ἡ τίς ἐστιν ἐξ ὑμῶν ἄνθρωπος ὃν αἰτήσῃ ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ἄρτον, μὴ λίθον ἐπιδώσῃ αὐτῷ;

10. Ἡ καὶ ἰχθύν αἰτήσῃ, μὴ ὄφιν ἐπιδώσῃ αὐτῷ;

11. Εἰ οὖν ὑμεῖς πονηροὶ ὄντες οἴδατε δόματα ἀγαθὰ διδόναι τοῖς τέκνοις ὑμῶν, πόσῳ μᾶλλον ὁ Πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς δώσει ἀγαθὰ τοῖς αἰτοῦσιν αὐτόν;

10. Πᾶς γὰρ ὁ αἰτῶν λαμβάνει, καὶ ὁ ζητῶν εὐρίσκει, καὶ τῷ χρούοντι ἀνοίγεται.

11. Τίνα δὲ ἐξ ὑμῶν αἰτήσῃ τὸν πατέρα ὁ υἱὸς ἄρτον, μὴ λίθον ἐπιδώσῃ αὐτῷ; ἢ καὶ ἰχθύν, μὴ ἀντὶ ἰχθύος ὄφιν αὐτῷ ἐπιδώσῃ;

12. Ἡ καὶ αἰτήσῃ ὥον, ἐπιδώσῃ αὐτῷ σκορπίον;

13. Εἰ οὖν ὑμεῖς πονηροὶ ὑπάρχοντες οἴδατε δόματα ἀγαθὰ διδόναι τοῖς τέκνοις ὑμῶν, πόσῳ μᾶλλον ὁ Πατὴρ ὁ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ δώσει Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον τοῖς αἰτοῦσιν αὐτόν;

5. And he said unto them: Who of you shall have a friend, and go unto him at midnight and say to him: Friend lend me three loaves;

6. For a friend of mine is come to me from a journey, and I have nothing to set before him;

7. And he from within shall answer and say: Trouble me not: the door is now shut, and my children are with me in bed; I cannot rise and give thee.

8. I say unto you: Though he will not rise and give him, because he is his friend, yet because of his importunity he will arise and give him as many as he needeth.

7. Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you:

8. For every one that asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh findeth; and to him that knocketh it shall be opened.

9. Or what man is there of you, who, if his son shall ask him for a loaf, will give him a stone?

10. Or if he shall ask for a fish, will give him a serpent?

11. If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father who is in Heaven give good things to them that ask him?

9. And I say unto you: Ask, and it shall be given you: seek, and he shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you.

10. For every one that asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh findeth; and to him that knocketh it shall be opened.

11. And of which of you that is a father shall his son ask a loaf, and he give him a stone? or a fish, and he for a fish give him a serpent?

12. Or if he shall ask an egg, will he give him a scorpion?

13. If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?

One of the chief duties of a Christian is to petition God for what he needs. Man is a poor necessitous creature; and it is of prime importance that he recognize this, and have recourse to the proper source of help. All men are necessitous. Some may be provided with temporal goods but man has other needs, the needs of his soul; if left alone, he can not provide for these. Christ therefore teaches us here the two great qualifications of petition. These are faith and perseverance.

The passage in Luke contains an illustration of the virtue of perseverance. The parable is homely and simple. It is founded on the customs of Eastern life. The needy friend comes to his friend at midnight seeking assistance. The hour is untimely, the house is closed, the children are asleep, and will be awakened if the parent arises. He gives a rather harsh

refusal, laying on the other the imputation of being troublesome. But the other persists even to the point of impudence, *ἀναίδεια*, and the other to exempt himself from the annoyance of the persistent appeal, arises and satisfies his petition.

No other philosopher ever presented his theories under such simple figures. The message of God was for the poor and the humble; it did not need the persuasive power of human words to lend it efficacy. Its power came from God, and it appears grander by the simplicity of the mode of presentation. The sense of the parable is to teach us the value of persistence in prayer. We should imitate the man who came at midnight seeking bread. God often defers his hearing to test our faith and constancy. Then should we show a sort of holy importunity, a sort of dogged persistence in pleading. God wishes to be importuned; he is more ready to give than we are to receive, but our welfare demands that God try our faith by seeming to withhold the object of our pleading.

The Lord now applies the sense of the parable to our relations to God. He bids us ask, and he promises that we shall receive. His bidding makes the law of our duty. His promise constitutes the basis of our firmest hope and consolation.

The great motive power in all that God has said to us, or done for us, is the love of God for us. This comes out forcibly here where Christ presses upon us his gifts, and exhausts the power of language to induce us to accept them.

It is a false habit of mind to look upon the world as a hard place, in which one must shift for himself. The false philosophy of man endeavors to prove that men are duped to attribute to divine Providence that which natural causes bring about. A voice of the world comes to us from the victory in battle that God is on the side of the strongest battalions. Another says; "Trust in God, and keep your powder dry." "Thus do the heathen rage, and the people imagine a vain thing." "And He that sitteth in the Heavens shall laugh; the Lord shall have them in derision."—Ps. II. 1, 4.

By the three ways in which the Lord bids us present our petition, he emphasizes the duty that we have to employ the energy of our being in petitioning relief from Heaven.

The promises of creatures leave a certain doubt in our minds, due to two causes. First these promises are not the act of an absolutely infallible being, and therefore we are not absolutely sure of their truth. Secondly, they are not the act of an omnipotent being, and therefore we are not absolutely sure of the possibility of the agent to fulfill the promise. But, in the present instance, all doubt is excluded by the attributes of the being who makes the promise. An absolutely infallible, all-powerful being makes here a promise. The consequence follows inevitably, that he will maintain what he promises. And that promise affects every man; pledges that God will give man all that he petitions. The promise of God has two conditions requisite for its fulfilment. One is expressed; the other is understood. The condition expressed is that we should ask God for what we need; the second condition is that the matter we pray for must be acceptable to God's will. Now through defect of both these conditions man's petitions are often not answered. As to the defect of the first condition, St. James says: "But let him ask in faith, nothing wavering. For he that wavereth is like a surge of the sea, driven with the wind and tossed. For let not that man think that he shall receive anything of the Lord." A wave of the sea has no stability resident in itself. It pursues no definite course, but yields itself always to the prevailing force. So it is with the man of weak faith. If he is with God, it is by accident. If contrary forces come upon him, they will bear him away.

Now God sees not alone the actual good and evil of our lives, but also the potential good and evil. He knows what is in man, and an inconstant state of man can not give God much glory. The mere listless utterance of forms of petition is not to ask in the sense here demanded by Christ. The petition should proceed from a faith that staggers at nothing, and with an earnestness that brings into action all the energies of man, and with a perseverance that stops only at death.

And in this perseverance man is encouraged by the parable of Luke. For if the dogged and unabashed insistence of the importunate pleader moved the cold and selfish heart of the

man to grant him all that he needed, in far greater degree will our petitions move God, whose love for us no creature can measure.

People complain that God seems so much farther away from the world now than in former days, and that Christ has withdrawn his spirit from the Church. The change is not with God, but with ourselves, who by our wavering faith repel God. God holds at a great price, that holy importunity and persistence in appeal which is not moved to petulance and despair if not heard at once, but which will not cease till it be heard, even though it be through a lifetime. We should not demand that God hear us in our time, but in his own time.

A grand example of persistence in prayer is furnished us by the example of Jacob, who wrestled with the angel, even to the morn, and would not let him go till he had blessed him. So we must wrestle with God in prayer, and not let him go till the night of our misery passes, and the dawn of hope comes on, and God blesses us.

The second defect in our petition is that the matter for which we pray is not in accordance with the will of God. God's will in relation to us is founded on his infinite wisdom, by which he sees the things which are good for us. Therefore his will is always beneficent. God wills that his glory shall be promoted by us, but in such way that our highest good shall be insured thereby. The good at which the will of God aims is man's own good. There is not an element of selfishness in God's will. In making the will of God the supreme end of our lives, we simply elect that infinite wisdom shall choose for us the highest good.

People who are not conversant with the ways of the law, give over their business affairs to an attorney, and follow his advice; men not skilled in medicine entrust their lives to a physician, and take from his hands bitter medicines, of whose nature they know nothing. They are content to use the science of these professional men in defect of their own knowledge. And shall man refuse to put equal trust in God in the vital issues of human life? St. James explains why our petitions are unheard. "Ye ask and receive not, because ye ask amiss, that ye may spend it in your pleasures."—IV. 3. Man esteems

and loves his life, its successes and honors, present health, and prosperity. These are good, and proper matter for petition. But attachment to them ceases to be good, when they are held in excessive esteem. We are too prone to limit our petitions to these goods only, and to measure God's response by material results.

In the Old Law, God upheld the faith of a crude weak people by the promise of riches for service. Abraham had vast wealth; Isaac's fields produced a hundredfold; and Joseph was made lord of the wealth of Egypt. But in the New Law, man enters on a higher plane of life. In return for service, God promises not to the saints of the New Law lands and cattle and gold, but persecution, the hatred of the world, and affliction. It is his wish that we petition him in affliction, and for a sufficiency of temporal goods, but never with the idea that this is the principal good.

The fruition of God's best gifts is not given here. To pray with earnestness only for the things of our present life, and to feel disappointment because God does not give us worldly benefits, is an evidence that we set a very low estimate on our true inheritance. We should realize therefore that we own something that we can not perceive by the natural faculties, that our movement into that inheritance should be characterized by appreciation, earnestness, and action. Let one's whole life be a constant appeal to Heaven for every good, with proper dispositions of soul, but leave to God the election of the gift. God may not give what we ask, but he will always give that which is good.

We love to see vigor and activity in every living organism. Faith is a living creation in the soul, and the earnestness and persistence with which we send our petitions to Heaven betoken its vigor and its life, and greatly please God.

Now if this proposition means anything, it means that benefits are bestowed on those who properly ask for them, that are not given under other conditions. It means also that it is greatly pleasing to God that we should direct to him our petitions. Unlike earthly benefactors, he never becomes annoyed at our importunities; but the more persistent we are, the more gracious he is to us. The power of prayer partakes in a certain

measure of the omnipotence of God. And God's wisdom supplies the defects in our petitions, and always gives us real good, although our dull minds may not perceive it. The loving parent often shows his love most when he refuses the request of the child. So God in infinite love is often constrained to deny us what we ask, in order to promote our higher interests.

The Lord enforces his teaching by an appeal to the natural propensity of the parent to give benefits to the child. The force of the illustration presupposes that the love of God for man is exalted above the natural love of parent for the child. God has given sufficient evidence by word and deed that he loves man. He can not teach man the measure of his love, because man's mind is incapable now of seizing such truth. But we could rightly form the following conclusion: As God's nature is exalted above the nature of man, so is his love for man exalted above the natural love of man for his child. The Lord loves to liken his love to the love of the parent for the child. In Isaiah he says: "Can a woman forget her suckling child, that she should not have compassion on the child of her womb? Yea they may forget, yet I will not forget thee."—Is. XLIX. 15. In the evidence of such existing love, the argument of the Lord here is most convincing.

The Vulgate translation of the eleventh verse of Luke is certainly erroneous. The concordant authority of the Greek codices establishes to a certainty that the translation should be: "If a son shall ask bread of any of you that is a father, will he give him a stone?" There is much grace of speech in all these propositions. To draw a graceful contrast in these statements the objects contrasted must be in one respect most like, and in another respect most dissimilar. They must be like in outward appearance and size; they must be essentially unlike in nature and use. Now a stone resembles in size, color, and outward appearance a loaf of bread; and a serpent resembles a fish. Many species of scorpions exist in nature. It is an anthropod, from two to eight inches in length, resembling a small, flat lobster. It has long powerful *chelate pedipalps* and a long flexible abdomen capable of being curled up over the back, and terminating in a deadly poisonous sting. It is only

found in hot climes. It was one of the most feared and hated of all creeping things. The scorpion bears no close resemblance to an egg, but it is a small animal, and if its flesh were edible, it would be in quantity about equal to the meat of an egg.

The Lord appeals to human experience to confirm this great truth, that love of whatever kind moves a being to do good to the loved object.

Let us represent to ourselves a good loving father and his son. The father has provision for the needs of the child. The child comes to him, and asks him for an article of food. The simile supposes that the child needs the food. The request is properly made, and it is good for the child to have the matter asked for. It is inconceivable that a loving father should refuse this food to the child, or tantalize him by giving him a useless or noxious object instead of the article of food. Such giving is an act of goodness, and is found in the creature who is not essentially good. Much more therefore will such act of goodness be found in God who is essential goodness itself.

There is some difficulty in determining the sense in which Christ called human nature bad. The entity of human nature, as it was created by God, is good. Certainly therefore Christ is not asserting that man is essentially bad. But in this sense is he bad. He exists in a defectible nature, and in comparison to the infinite good of God's essence, every creature may be called imperfect. This may have been the sense in which our Lord spoke. Again, in such declarations as these the speaker does not consider the metaphysical man, but the man of history, the man as he is found in human society. In such sense, man compared in perfection to his Creator may rightly be called bad. He exists in a nature which has fallen from the estate in which God founded it; he is subject to disordered passions, to intense selfishness, greed and fleshly lusts; the best of his kind offend God by various sins; the greater part of the race abandon the service of God. Is it strange therefore that, looking at man as he is, and contrasting him to the infinite essence of God, Christ should have called man evil?

The application of the similitude to man's relations to God is obvious. Man needs something, and comes to God seeking it. The matter is conformable to God's will, and therefore, it

is good for man to have it. The petition is rightly made; God is able to give it. The only cause therefore which could underlie a refusal on the part of God would be defect of love. But no man having knowledge of God will impute to him defect of love for man. God is pledged for the relief of our needs properly laid before him in petition. He wishes for our petitions, not that he is ignorant of our necessities, but that he wishes for our faith and love, evidenced by our asking for help. It is not to say that God does nothing in the line of his special providence for us without our asking. Verily he does many things for us ungrateful creatures, even when we are too cold and oblivious of him to ask for what we need, but he does still more, much more, for the faithful and persistent pleader.

How explain therefore the seeming delay of God in hearing our prayers? how explain the hope that starts up feverishly at the prospect of relief, and sickens at the long delay? The explanation is outlined by the thirteenth verse of St. Luke. The gift which man needs most, and which God delays not to give is his Holy Spirit, The function of the Holy Ghost in our lives is well described by St. Paul, Rom. VIII. 26: "Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities, for we know not what we should pray for as we ought; but the Spirit himself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered." When God gives us his Holy Spirit, he makes adequate provision for all our needs. The Spirit of God operates in that higher order of being in which man's spiritual interests are placed. He enriches our souls, even while we clamor for the husks of earth. And yet we feel little gratitude at the certainty held out to us that the Holy Ghost will come with his rich spiritual gifts into our souls at our asking. We would prefer the mess of pottage of Esau to the benediction of Jacob. And we murmur and complain like wanton children because God operates to insure our estate in Heaven in preference to the baser things of earth, which our godless generation unduly prizes. God at times extends his hand, and takes away a deep sorrow, or gives some temporal gift, but it is not his highest gift to man; and it is only given when it does not conflict with man's spiritual interests.

MATT. VII. 12—14.

12. All things therefore whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, even so do ye also unto them: for this is the Law and the Prophets.

13. Enter ye in by the narrow gate: for wide is the gate, and broad is the way that leadeth to destruction, and many be they that enter in thereby.

14. How narrow is the gate, and straitened the way, that leadeth unto life, and few be they that find it!

12. Πάντα οὖν ὅσα ἂν θέλητε ἵνα ποιῶσιν ὑμῖν οἱ ἄνθρωποι, οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιεῖτε αὐτοῖς: οὗτος γάρ ἐστιν ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται.

13. Εἰσέλθατε διὰ τῆς στενῆς πύλης, ὅτι πλατεῖα ἡ πύλη καὶ εὐρύχωρος ἡ ὁδὸς ἡ ἀπάγουσα εἰς τὴν ἀπώλειαν καὶ πολλοὶ εἰσιν οἱ εἰσερχόμενοι δι' αὐτῆς.

14. Τί δὲ στενὴ ἡ πύλη καὶ τεθλιμμένη ἡ ὁδὸς ἡ ἀπάγουσα εἰς τὴν ζωὴν, καὶ ὀλίγοι εἰσιν οἱ εὕρισκοντες αὐτήν.

The twelfth verse of Matthew has already been expounded in Luke VI. 31. In one short clear proposition, the Lord condenses the law of obligations which we have to our fellow men. It is the Law and the Prophets. That is, it is the sum of the Mosaic Law and of the subsequent Holy Books, as regards our conduct towards our neighbor. The common instincts of humanity endorse the divine teaching in this matter. It is eminently reasonable, eminently practical. It is the highest wisdom in the simplest words. It can be impressed on the rudest minds, and appeals to the inborn sense of right in man. It points out that man can always appeal to his own conscience and find there a safe and sure criterion for acts towards the neighbor.

The Lord likens human life to a journey along a definite way. In that part of the discourse which has preceded, Christ set forth the law of man's duty; he now exhorts man to put into act the doctrine that he has received. In speaking of the gate and the way, his intention is not to establish two elements in man's journey, but to assist the mind to a vivid picture of two modes of human life.

The present characterization of human life and its destiny is terrible but true. To soften the sense of the Lord's words,

some have imagined that he only spoke of the moral conditions of the world of his time, when the chosen people had drifted from God, and the new message had not yet reached the world. Such restriction of the Lord's words to the special conditions then prevailing is plainly absurd. The context and the general character of Christ's mode of teaching, plainly evidence that the words contain a characterization of human life. The sense of the words dispel the illusion that a man can drift along with loose ideas on religion, living the life of the world, and reach eternal life. Man must choose a definite mode of religious living, and prosecute it with the view to attain to eternal life.

The Lord first describes the way of living of the world. It is broad and easy. It appeals to crude nature; it involves no restraint. We go on in it without moral effort, following natural motives. It is pleasant to the natural man. There are no fierce combats against the lusts of the flesh and against the world, no renunciation, no chastisement of the flesh. Of course, it has in it none of those deeper joys that come from the consciousness of duty nobly performed, but the thoughtless multitudes, who live on the surface of things, reckon not at the absence of these. Such careless life is easy, and demands no deep thought, no sacrifices, and its motives can be apprehended by the senses. Moreover, the multitudes are there. The people whom we meet in social converse are there. The public thought of the day is a voice from that broad path, and invites us to travel therein. Popular men, successful men are there. We are drawn by the tide towards the same broad road. It is hard to stand aloof, and follow a hard and unpopular law of conduct, when all about us men are moving in another direction.

The poor Christian lives in the midst of a world which by the testimony of John, IV. 19, "lieth wholly in wickedness." The moral atmosphere is filled with false philosophy and vain theories. And many a man, who has resisted for a time, ends by going with the crowd. And thus the great stream of humanity rolls onward through that terrible road, forgetful of God, forgetful of Heaven. Generation after generation passes on, and perishes, and no word of God is sufficient to arrest the dreadful procession.

Opposed to this broad and thronged way is the narrow gate and straitened way that lead to life. Here again the use of the gate and the way is synonymous, and the terms merely strengthen each other in the metaphorical expression of the difficulty of the way of righteousness. The Lord is not describing an entity in *rerum natura*, nor does he lead our minds to discuss the exact arrangement of the gate and the road. The great force of the figure does not lie in the narrowness of the gate, nor the narrowness of the way, but in its difficulty.

There is an important variant in the fourteenth verse. The variant arises from two different readings of the opening word in the Greek text. Tischendorf, Westcott, and Hort approve the reading $\delta\tau\iota$, the causal conjunction, which would correspond to Latin *quia*. This reading is adopted by the protestant English translations. Such reading is also found in codices \aleph and B, but in both cases it is a correction of the second hand. It is found in Codex X, in Codex M, and in the Sahidic, Bohairic, and Armenian versions. However a large number of codices support the reading $\tau\acute{\iota}$, and it is found in many versions, and in the works of St. Ephrem and St. Cyprian. It is endorsed by the Vulgate, and came thence into the Roman Catholic version. This reading is critically preferable both by its extrinsic authority, and its conformity with the canons of criticism. $\tau\acute{\iota}$ is the more difficult reading, and it is easily seen how the sciolists is perplexity substituted therefor the easier reading $\delta\tau\iota$. Moreover, the reading $\delta\tau\iota$, renders the discourse of the Lord languid and tautological; for he had before declared that the gate of life was narrow. We believe therefore that the reading $\tau\acute{\iota}$ is to be retained, and we consider the sentence exclamatory in character. $\tau\acute{\iota}$ corresponds to the Hebrew הֵן , and is used in a sense where $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ would be used in classic Greek. Similar renderings of הֵן are found in the Septuagint.—Cfr. II. Sam. VI. 20; Ps. III. 1; Cant. I. 10; VII. 6.

As the Lord views the two ways of human life, the terrible truth of the difficulty of righteousness, and the fewness of the elect elicits from him this earnest exclamation. As we have said before Christ was there reflecting on the way of human life

throughout all its ages. His words are borne out by fact both as regards nations and as regards individuals. In the case of nations, a nation is not rated by whether the institutions of God are upheld in her realm, or whether her people obey God; but she is rated by her revenues, her army and her navy. And in human society, observation shows plainly what a small portion of humanity profess a definite belief in Christ and his law, and only a part of these retain that living faith which reflects itself in the character of a man's life. To find in human society the man who with definite aim is moving along in the narrow path is not the rule but the exception.

Now it is expedient for man to keep these two truths in mind in his progress in the law of Christ, that it is a narrow and difficult path, and that the elect are few. One succeeds much better in an undertaking when he has counted the cost, and has moved the mind to the proper preparation for that which is to be expected. Of course, the difficulties of that way will only be felt by those who are doers of the word. The more one goes with the world, the more does he lessen these difficulties. To move faithfully in the narrow way of Christ, one must in large degree oppose all the thought of the world, which comes to us in multifarious and powerful agencies; he must oppose popular theories, which appeal to the proud aspirations of a people; he must oppose the perverse movements of his own nature. It is hard to do this, and often the error prevails that one is doing it when he is not. A perpetual vigilance must be kept up, or one will unconsciously fall into the easier way of doing as the rest do. The very nature of the Christian life is such that one must go somewhat deeply into it to find its real nature, and to find something that will sustain a man in his combat with the spirit of the world. Now these are not days of deep religious thinking. Hence the call of the world assembles its myriads, and the call of Christ collects the few.

No mystery is more sad than that the Redemption of Christ will be unavailing for the far greater part of mankind. Put away, therefore, the fatal error that salvation is easy to achieve. Such error breaks down the distinction between the Christian and the man of the world; and while it leaves a man

nominally in the ranks of Christ, it renders him without religious character. The narrow way is not found without earnest seeking; whereas the broad way of the world offers itself to all. In the narrow way we can not walk without continual restraint and patient effort; the very impetus of unredeemed nature bears us on in the broad way. Moreover, man is an imitative animal, and it is easier to imitate the multitudes of the world than the few of Christ. Now as the prudent mariner often consults his compass to get his bearings in the pathless ocean, so the Christian should often by proper thought and self-examination certify himself that he is in the narrow and difficult way that leads to life.

MATT. VII. 15—23.

LUKE VI. 43—46.

15. Προσέχετε ἀπὸ τῶν ψευδοπροφητῶν, οἵτινες ἔρχονται πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐν ἐνδύμασιν προβάτων, ἔσωθεν δέ εἰσιν λύκοι ἄρπαγες:

16. Ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν αὐτῶν ἐπιγνώσεσθε αὐτούς: μήτι συλλέγουσιν ἀπὸ ἀκανθῶν σταφυλὰς ἢ ἀπὸ τριβόλων σῦκα;

17. Οὕτως πᾶν δένδρον ἀγαθὸν καρποὺς ποιεῖ καλοὺς, τὸ δὲ σαπρὸν δένδρον καρποὺς πονηροὺς ποιεῖ.

18. Οὐ δύναται δένδρον ἀγαθὸν καρποὺς πονηροὺς ἐνεγκεῖν, οὐδὲ δένδρον σαπρὸν καρποὺς καλοὺς ποιεῖν.

19. Πᾶν δένδρον μὴ [ποιοῦν καρπὸν καλὸν ἐκκόπτεται καὶ εἰς πῦρ βάλλεται.

20. Ἄρα γε ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν αὐτῶν ἐπιγνώσεσθε αὐτούς.

21. Οὐ πᾶς ὁ λέγων μοι: Κύριε, Κύριε, εἰσελεύσεται εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν, ἀλλ' ὁ ποιῶν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Πατρὸς μου τοῦ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

43. Οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν δένδρον καλὸν ποιοῦν καρπὸν σαπρὸν: οὐδὲ πάλιν δένδρον σαπρὸν ποιοῦν καρπὸν καλόν.

44. Ἐκαστον γὰρ δένδρον ἐκ τοῦ ἰδίου καρποῦ γινώσκειται: οὐ γὰρ ἐξ ἀκανθῶν συλλέγουσιν σῦκα, οὐδὲ ἐκ βάλτου σταφυλὴν τρυγῶσιν.

45. Ὁ ἀγαθὸς ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ θησαυροῦ τῆς καρδίας προφέρει τὸ ἀγαθόν: καὶ ὁ πονηρὸς ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ προφέρει τὸ πονηρόν: ἐκ γὰρ περισσεύματος καρδίας λαλεῖ τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ.

46. Τί δέ μοι καλεῖτε: Κύριε, Κύριε, καὶ οὐ ποιεῖτε ἃ λέγω.

22. Πολλοὶ ἐροῦσίν μοι ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ: Κύριε, Κύριε, οὐ τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι ἐπροφητεύσαμεν, καὶ τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι δαιμόνια ἐξεβάλομεν καὶ τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι δυνάμεις πολλὰς ἐποιήσαμεν;

23. Καὶ τότε ὁμολογήσω αὐτοῖς ὅτι οὐδέποτε ἔγνων ὑμᾶς, ἀποχωρεῖτε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι τὴν ἀνομίαν.

15. Beware of false prophets, who come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly are ravening wolves.

16. By their fruits ye shall know them. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles?

17. Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but the corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit.

18. A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit.

19. Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire.

20. Therefore by their fruits ye shall know them.

21. Not every one that saith unto me; Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of Heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father who is in Heaven.

43. For there is no good tree that bringeth forth corrupt fruit; nor again a corrupt tree that bringeth forth good fruit.

44. For each tree is known by its own fruit. For of thorns men do not gather figs, nor of a bramble bush gather they grapes.

45. The good man out of the good treasure of his heart bringeth forth that which is good; and the evil man out of the evil treasure bringeth forth that which is evil: for out of the abundance of the heart his mouth speaketh.

46. And why call ye me: Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?

22. Many will say to me in that day: Lord, Lord, did we not prophesy by thy name, and by thy name cast out devils, and by thy name do many mighty works?

23. And then will I profess unto them: I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity.

The Lord directs his teaching in the present passage to two chief objects. First, he directly attacks the Pharisees, and secondly, he shows the vanity of religious profession without God-like dispositions. By the false prophets he directly means the Pharisees. Of course, as his words contain a truth, and truth is eternal, his words apply to men of all ages, of the character of the Pharisees, but Christ aimed his words in the first part of the passage chiefly at the Pharisees. The figure is very forcible. To understand it fully, we must liken the community to a flock of sheep. Now the wolf introduces himself thither under the skin and semblance of a sheep. The power of the figure does not demand that such fact could be verified *in rerum natura*, but it demands that such idea be conceivable. It is easy to conceive and needless to state what ravages a wolf thus introduced into a flock of sheep would do.

In applying the metaphor to human life, we must know that a bland religious exterior is the sheep's clothing, under which the wicked man insinuates himself into the trust and favor of the faithful. In calling these wolves ravening, the Lord is not pointing out any particular kind of wolf, but portraying the general nature of the wolf. By means of an affected piety the Pharisees secured themselves in the reverence of the people, and they made use of this religious esteem to filch from the people their substance. Moreover, they kept the people in ignorance of the great import of the Law, and led them away from Christ. Now in order to deliver the people from these hypocrites, it was necessary to unmask the Pharisees.

The fifteenth verse of Matthew is one of the masterpieces of Christ to describe the character and methods of these sectaries. Inasmuch as it primarily related to the special conditions of the Jewish people, it has been omitted by Luke.

Now it must be borne in mind that the Lord is not here laying down a criterion by which we may distinguish the true doctrine from the false by the character of the teacher. For in Matthew, XXIII. 2, 3, Christ says regarding the doctrine of these same Pharisees: "The scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' seat. All therefore whatsoever they bid you, that observe and do: but do not ye after their works: for they say, and do not." Therefore it was the pernicious example of the Pharisees concerning which Christ cautioned his followers.

Of course, the Pharisees erred in not receiving Christ as the Messiah, and they misled the people in moving them to reject him. But Christ had especial regard to the law of moral precepts in telling the people to do all the Pharisees bade. The people were dependent on the Pharisees for the interpretation of the moral precepts of the Mosaic Law till the New Covenant should be promulgated.

It would be a very mischievous error, if by misinterpreting the present passage we made the criterion of true doctrine the character of its teachers. It would make the divine element of the Church absolutely dependent on the human element. In certain cases it may happen that the exponent of the true faith may be a low, base, venal fellow, and even a criminal; while the teacher of the false sect may be blameless in his life, and given to every good work. The lives of some of those who have sat in the chair of Peter were stained by the foulest crimes, and were a scandal to the people, and yet they were the chief representatives on earth of the true doctrine. We believe, therefore, that Christ here simply cautions them against the pernicious influence of bad men, and gives them a sure rule to distinguish a bad man.

Here the argument broadens, and becomes world-wide in its application. Hence this part has been recorded by Luke.

There is no conflict between the present teaching and the precept forbidding to judge. In this present argument the Lord simply bids us accept the evidence of facts to safeguard

us against the seductive influence of wily bad men. The precept of not judging is not intended to shield and protect hypocrites and seducers. It chiefly regards the defects and errors of those who, though they step aside from the path of right, yet aspire after the good. But the present argument also furnishes a means of judging of our own religious status, and in this respect its sense is most valuable. It establishes that man's standing before God is not determined by what he proposes to be, or what he seems to be, but by what he is.

The nature of the fruit of a tree certifies us of the nature of the tree. The Saviour chose for his illustration the fig tree and the vine, because they were indigenous to the East, and well known to the people. Now it is a physical impossibility that the useful fruits of the fig tree and the vine should be borne by the worthless thorn-bush and the thistle. The thorn-bush and the thistle may be in the orchard or the vineyard; they may have the same fertility of soil and the same care as the good trees, but they will only bear thorns and thistles, because it is their nature so to bear. The end of these worthless growths is to be cut down and burned.

The moral application of this simile to the life of man is very valuable. The real moral nature of man is not manifested by profession of Christianity, nor by affiliation with a church, nor by certain routine observances of religion. Man's real moral standing is manifested solely by his deeds, and these form the basis of the judgment of God. The man whose deeds are evil, in the awful scrutiny of God, will be cut down, and cast into the fire. Religious profession is good and necessary; reception of the Sacraments, and attendance at worship are necessary; but all these are means to an end. They are ordained for the sanctification of the nature of man; and if they fail to do that, they are of no avail; not through their own intrinsic defect, but through man's voluntary worthlessness.

Of course, the simile is applied to man in a moral sense. The thorn-bush and the vine are by physical impossibility unable to change their nature; and also the profitable fruit tree in like manner can not change its nature. But man can change his moral nature. The bad can become good, and the good, bad. Man receives certain endowments and dispositions by

heredity, but these do not place a man under a moral impossibility to change them. Hence the force of the Lord's example is in this that the kingdom of God in a man is not an external initiation into a religious body; but it is a change of heart, a sanctification of the inner nature of man. Good works are not the result of merely turning one's attention and energy to do one thing rather than another. They are products of the real nature of the man, and if that nature be not inly sanctified, these deeds will not be good.

It is not to say that a good man, with nature refined and ennobled by the natural and supernatural motives, may not step aside, and fall into sin. Though he may by that act forfeit the love of God, and render himself liable to eternal damnation, yet he does not thereby change and violate his nature, so that his whole character becomes changed. *Nemo ex tempore nequissimus*. And on the other hand, a man of base, depraved nature may under certain conditions do a deed of goodness, and still remain of the same general character. The Lord's words do not mean that every individual act of the sanctified nature is good, nor that every deed of the unredeemed nature is bad. He is establishing a moral criterion for gauging a man's life, and the nature of the theme demands that it is not to be used as a mathematical measure. We can not determine the moral tenor of a man's life by one act, nor by an insufficient number of acts. We must consider the deeds of a man's life in the manner that they establish a character. The stronger and more pronounced that character, the greater is the moral certainty that the man's acts will be in conformity with it.

In the twenty-first verse of Matthew, the repetition of the Lord's name in the compellation denotes profuse external profession, and the sense of the verse is that no matter how great the religious profession may be, it is vain without the essential sanctification of the man's nature. Religious profession is a necessary requisite, and therefore only those whose inner nature is out of keeping with the religious profession fall under the denunciation of Christ. To say: Lord, Lord, is good; but it is rendered hypocritical and vain when the life does not correspond with the profession.

Now adequate judgment can not be passed on the fruit of a tree, till it has ripened, and is being gathered by the lord of the orchard. So it is only in the day of judgment that the fruits of man's life receive their definitive judgment. In that awful day all shams and unsubstantial appearances will vanish, and only realities will remain. Then if a man be found to have fruit, it will be because his nature was inwardly sanctified. There may have been defects and falls in his life, as some of the fruit falls from the best tree, but such falls were redeemed by true inward penitence, and the predominant force in his life made for righteousness. Therefore it is not the name of the tree, nor the orchard in which it grows, that determines the value of the tree, but its fruit determines the tree's value.

The import of these words is a reproach to many. It is a reproach to those who profess religion, and act according to the motives of the world; a reproach to those who make religion a thing for Sunday only, who wear religion like a suit of fine clothes, covering a foul and deformed body. It is a reproach to those who think they undo the effects of a long period of sin by a rapid half-incoherent confession, leading to no change of life. Usually when such men come back, if they ever do come back, after a long period, one finds the record several degrees worse than on the preceding date. And this is because the man's nature was never moved in its depths from the old way to the way of righteousness. To reform a nature vitiated by sin is not an affair that can be lightly done by dropping into the confessional, and stammering out a dreary recital of sin.

Penance is a change of soul, or it is nothing. Let a man therefore realize that religion is the cultivation of his inward nature. It is an enterprise to which he must give more than the few moments that the many give to religious issues. It is his life's work.

It is a sad fact that on many so-called Christians religion sits lightly. The commission of a mortal sin will be a rare thing in the life of a man who is permeated with the spirit of the Gospel.

Although the Lord simply gives here a safe rule for judging the religious status of a man, nevertheless *a pari* we may take a large view of history, and detect the true Church of Christ by

its results. It is thus true that the eminent sanctity of many thousands of her children is an evidence of the divine commission of the Church. She is a moral person, and by her fruits she is known. She represents a divine power, and where there is such a power there will be effects. Many of her children have proven false to her, and many will prove false; but the characteristic note of her sanctity will always remain, because her constitution and character are holy, and she must produce like fruit.

The closing verses of the passage represents an interview between the Supreme Judge and many of the class of whom he has here spoken. In order to catch the full import of these important words, we must imagine ourselves present at the scene, and consider the plea of the accused, and the sentence of the Judge.

The time is the day of judgment. The accused opens his case by a profuse profession of faith, and then enters his plea: He has prophesied; he has cast out devils; and he has done many wonderful works in the name of Christ.

At this point a serious difficulty engages our attention. Prophecy, the casting out of demons, and the working of these wonderful works are effects of the extraordinary power of God. One of the reasons that such power was conferred upon men was to evince their divine commission. For such reason Christ made use of his divine power to prove that he was the Son of God. The prophets of old received this power, and the Apostles received the same, for the purpose of drawing men to accept Christ's doctrine. In the early ages of the Church these manifestations of divine power were called the *charismata*, or *gratiæ gratis datæ*, and their purpose was the edification of the faithful. When the status of the Church became such in the world that he who had a mind to seek for her could find her, these *charismata* in large measure ceased. The teaching power of the Church is now so great that she needs not miracles to support her claims.

But now the difficulty arises, that these men, who are declared reprobate by the Judge, lay claim to have worked these miracles in his name. Can therefore an evil man possess these *charismata*, and work these great works in the name of

Christ? In the first place, it is certain that no man can exercise such power to inculcate false doctrines. Were such to happen, God would allow the extraordinary exercise of his divine power to be used to induce the people into error. Hence it is certain that these *charismata* could only be used to promote the cause of Christ. It is not therefore in faith or doctrine that those here mentioned erred, but in the moral government of their lives. Now it appears from Paul's epistles that some of those who received these *charismata* were reprehensible in conduct; for he chastises them for their envy of one another, and reproves their ambition to possess those gifts which would make them conspicuous before men.

We believe it possible that a man, possessing this extraordinary power, should fail in the inward sanctity of his life. The Lord chooses some representative reprobates of this class to illustrate the truth that it is vain to profess faith if one works iniquity. The force of the Lord's words is not confined to those of this special class. He chooses them as fit representatives of the great class who profess religion but are devoid of inward sanctity. His argument proceeds *a fortiori*. If faith and profession even to the extent of miracle-working will avail naught to the man who has not sanctified his nature, *a fortiori* the weaker faith and less positive profession will be profitless to that large mass of men who are Christians in name only.

There is a strong resemblance between the present teaching of Jesus and that of Paul to the Corinthians I. XIII. 2: "And though I have prophecy, and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge; and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing." These truths establish with terrible certainty that there is nothing that will count for aught in that dreadful day but the living faith, which sanctifies the inner man and becomes an enduring principle of good works. This is vital religion; all else is mere pretence and a sham. Religious profession and the externals of religion do not divide the world into the blessed and the reprobate. In order to receive eternal life, man must believe and do.

MATT. VII. 24—29.

24. Πᾶς οὖν ὅστις ἀκούει μου τοὺς λόγους τούτους, καὶ ποιεῖ αὐτούς, ὁμοιωθήσεται ἀνδρὶ φρονίμῳ ὅστις ὠκοδόμησεν αὐτοῦ τὴν οἰκίαν ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν.

25. Καὶ κατέβη ἡ βροχή, καὶ ἦλθον οἱ ποταμοί, καὶ ἔπνευσαν οἱ ἄνεμοι, καὶ προσέπεσαν τῇ οἰκίᾳ ἐκείνῃ, καὶ οὐκ ἔπεσαν: τεθεμελίωτο γὰρ ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν.

26. Καὶ πᾶς ὁ ἀκούων μου τοὺς λόγους τούτους, καὶ μὴ ποιῶν αὐτούς, ὁμοιωθήσεται ἀνδρὶ μωρῷ, ὅστις ὠκοδόμησεν αὐτοῦ τὴν οἰκίαν ἐπὶ τὴν ἄμμον.

27. Καὶ κατέβη ἡ βροχή, καὶ ἦλθον οἱ ποταμοί, καὶ ἔπνευσαν οἱ ἄνεμοι, καὶ προσέκοψαν τῇ οἰκίᾳ ἐκείνῃ, καὶ ἔπεσαν: καὶ ἦν ἡ πτώσις αὐτῆς μεγάλη.

28. Καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοὺς λόγους τούτους, ἐξεπλήρσοντο οἱ ὄχλοι ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ.

29. Ἦν γὰρ διδάσκων αὐτοὺς ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων, καὶ οὐχ ὡς οἱ γραμματεῖς αὐτῶν.

24. Every one therefore who heareth these words of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man who built his house upon the rock;

25. And the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell not: for it was founded upon the rock.

LUKE VI. 47—49.

47. Πᾶς ὁ ἐρχόμενος πρὸς με, καὶ ἀκούων μου τῶν λόγων, καὶ ποιῶν αὐτούς, ὑποδείξω ὑμῖν τίνε ἐστὶν ὅμοιος.

48. Ὁμοίος ἐστὶν ἀνθρώπῳ οἰκοδομοῦντι οἰκίαν, ὃς ἔσκαψεν καὶ ἐβάθυνεν, καὶ ἔθηκεν θεμέλιον ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν: πλημμύρης δὲ γενομένης, προσέρρηξεν ὁ ποταμὸς τῇ οἰκίᾳ ἐκείνῃ, καὶ οὐκ ἴσχυσεν σαλεῦσαι αὐτήν, διὰ τὸ καλῶς οἰκοδομεῖσθαι αὐτήν.

49. Ὁ δὲ ἀκούσας, καὶ μὴ ποιήσας, ὅμοίος ἐστὶν ἀνθρώπῳ οἰκοδομήσαντι οἰκίαν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν χωρὶς θεμελίου: ἣ προσέρρηξεν ὁ ποταμός: καὶ εὐθὺς συνέπεσεν, καὶ ἐγένετο τὸ ρῆγμα τῆς οἰκίας ἐκείνης μέγα.

47. Every one that cometh unto me, and heareth my words, and doeth them, I will shew you to whom he is like:

48. He is like a man building a house, who digged and went deep, and laid a foundation upon the rock: and when a flood arose, the stream broke against that house, and could

26. And every one that heareth these words of mine, and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man, who built his house upon the sand:

27. And the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and smote upon that house; and it fell: and great was the fall thereof.

28. And it came to pass, when Jesus ended these words, the multitudes were astonished at his teaching:

29. For he taught them as one having authority, and not as their scribes.

not shake it, because it had been well builded.

49. But he that heareth and doeth not, is like a man that built a house upon the earth without a foundation; against which the stream broke, and straightway it fell in; and the ruin of that house was great.

A textual variant of some importance occurs in the twenty-fourth verse of Matthew. The Codices **N**, **B**, and **Z** read *ὁμοιωθήσεται*, which is rendered in the Vulgate by *assimilabitur*. Tischendorf, Westcott, and Hort approve this reading. The Roman Catholic version follows this reading, and renders it: "shall be like," etc. It has also some patristic support. But the reading endorsed by the greater number of codices, Fathers, and versions is *ὁμοιώσω αὐτόν*. This reading is adopted by the English protestant versions, being rendered: "I will liken him," etc. The proofs are vastly in favor of this second reading. It renders the statement of Christ more forcible. Again, it would be hard to conceive how the second reading ever found place in the codices as an interpolation, since it renders the sentence anacoluthic, and is the more difficult to construe. The probable fact is that the reading *ὁμοιώσω αὐτόν* was changed to *ὁμοιωθήσεται*, in order to make the twenty-fourth verse accord with the twenty-sixth.

In the forty-eighth verse of Luke there is also a slight variant. The greater number of Greek codices render the causal clause, with which the verse terminates, *τεθεμελίωτο*

γὰρ ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν, which is followed by the Vulgate and all versions except the Coptic and Revised Version of Oxford. The codices \aleph , B, L, Z, 33, 157, and the Coptic and Oxford versions support the reading διὰ τὸ καλῶς οἰκοδομῆσθαι αὐτήν, "because it was well built." The variant does not change the sense. The received reading gives the specific cause of the house's firmness, while the second reading assigns only a generic one. It is impossible and unnecessary to decide which is the true reading.

The Lord closes his great sermon by a beautiful similitude, by which he impresses upon men's minds the necessity of doing the word which they receive.

The civilized world is divided as regards the Gospel of Christ into two great classes. First there are the many who do not profess to receive Christ's teachings or to follow his law. Then there are the professors of Christianity. We may rightly place in the first category the heretics, for they do not hear Christ aright. We consider therefore in the second class only those who, at least in name, are in the salvific economy of Christ. Now it is only to these that the closing similitude pertains. The Lord's words divide this class into wise men and fools. The right ordering of human life is the highest wisdom; and the misuse of life is the greatest folly. The Lord likens the conduct of Christian life to the building of a house. We need spend little time in explaining the natural basis of the similitude. The first element of strength in a building is the solidity of the foundations. To obtain this solidity the prudent builder digs down, and lays the foundation upon the rock. The storms of the Orient are very violent. The house will be exposed to violent storms of wind and rain and inundations. Now in such commotions of nature the house upon the solid foundation will stand, and the house built upon unstable earth will fall.

One house may look as fair as another. In the calm, the dwellers in the unstable house may feel secure and self-contented. The cause which differentiates these two buildings is hidden; it requires the test of the storm to prove which has solidity and which has not.

The application of the truth to human life is plain and forcible. The religious status of a man at any given moment is a house which he has built by the acts of his life in co-operating with the action of God. If he has hearkened to the message of Christ, and assimilated its truths, and made them a part of himself; if he moves in the acts of his life in the spirit of the Gospel; if the law of God is the great vital motive force of his life; if in all things, he fears God, then he has dug deep, and laid his foundation upon a rock. On the other hand, the man who holds to Christ with a sort of velleity; who would like to be good, if it were not difficult; who aspires weakly after the good, but does the evil; who gives ear to Christ on Sunday, and to the world on Monday and the rest of the week; who is dull and torpid in religion, and intense in business,—this is the man who builds on the sand. He has no definite purpose in his religious life, he is not moved by the Spirit of God. In the acts of his life there is not reflected the evidences of a vital knowledge of God.

The rain and the floods and the winds emblemize the forces of the world, which act in opposition to the law of God. They act upon both lives. Their impetus is terrible. They roar, and surge, and beat upon the respective individuals, and one falls; the superficial Christian falls; and then is verified the great fall spoken of by Christ, the terrible tragedy of the wreck of a human life.

Under the track of the ships that cross the great ocean, a white line of human bones cover the bottom of the ocean, of those who have gone down in shipwreck and in death by disease on that voyage. So in the voyage of life, the way is marked by the ghastly evidences of the myriads who walked foolishly, and perished by the way. But the sturdy Christian, strong in the Spirit of God resident within him, defies the adverse forces of the world, and marches on "through the fever of life, through wearinesses and sicknesses, fightings and despondings, langour and fretfulness, struggling and succeeding through all the chances and changes of this troubled, unhealthy state, through death, to the white throne of God, and the Beatific Vision."

The foundation on which the moral edifice of a man's life is built is his character. Many things enter into the constitution of a man's character. Heredity, education, environment, habits of life are the great factors. We cannot change heredity; it is a mysterious element with which only God can rightly deal in the judgment. Environment is a contingent thing partly under our control and partly without it. We can not control our environment during childhood, and even in adult life there may be circumstances which tie us to certain unfavorable surroundings. A man's early education may have been neglected, and his habits may have become perverted during his early years, and at the full evolution of reason a man may find himself handicapped in the race. A certain manner of thinking and a manner of acting have been developed in him. But by the power of free will and God's grace even such a one may move upwards towards the goal of true manhood. Every virtuous thought, every deed of virtue strengthens the foundation. The man must be in earnest. He must be prepared for trial, struggle, and renunciation. He is not alone in the work: God gives grace richly to a man who is striving after righteousness. By sober reflection on the duty of human life, the man comes to formulate certain principles of right conduct. His deeds of virtue are thus not mere accidents; they are the methodical result of fixed principles. A sturdiness of character develops in the man. Moral courage grows in him. His whole life grows nobler, a moral healthiness pervades his whole being; the house is being built on the rock. The man is not a Christian to suit the occasion; but a Christian by principle, a Christian in all the affairs of life. The storms of life come to all, but they find such a man immovable in the storm, for he rests on a foundation too deep for storms to move.

MATT. VIII. 5—13.

5. Εἰσελθόντος δὲ αὐτοῦ εἰς Καφαρναούμ, προσῆλθεν αὐτῷ ἑκαστόνταρχος παρακαλῶν αὐτόν,

6. Καὶ λέγων· Κύριε, ὁ παῖς μου βέβληται ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ παραλυτικῶς, δεινῶς βασανιζόμενος.

LUKE VII. 1—10.

1. Ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐπλήρωσεν πάντα τὰ ρήματα αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰς ἀκοὰς τοῦ λαοῦ, εἰσῆλθεν εἰς Καφαρναούμ.

2. Ἐκατοντάρχου δὲ τινος δοῦλος κακῶς ἔχων, ἤμελλεν τελευτᾶν, ὃς ἦν αὐτῷ ἑντίμος.

3. 'Ακούσας δὲ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ἀπέστειλεν πρὸς αὐτὸν πρεσβυτέρους τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ἐρωτῶν αὐτὸν ὅπως ἐλθὼν διασώσῃ τὸν δοῦλον αὐτοῦ.

4. Οἱ δὲ παραγενόμενοι πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν, παρεκάλουν αὐτὸν σπουδαίως, λέγοντες: ὅτι ἄξιός ἐστιν, ὃ παρὲξ τοῦτο.

5. Ἀγαπᾷ γὰρ τὸ ἔθνος ἡμῶν καὶ τὴν συναγωγὴν αὐτὸς ὡχοδόμησεν ἡμῖν.

7. Λέγει αὐτῷ, Ἐγὼ ἐλθὼν θεραπεύσω αὐτόν.

8. Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ ἑκατόνταρχος ἔφη: Κύριε, οὐκ εἰμὶ ἱκανὸς ἵνα μου ὑπὸ τὴν στέγην εἰσέλθῃς: ἀλλὰ μόνον εἰπέ λόγῳ, καὶ ἰαθήσεται ὁ παῖς μου.

6. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἐπορεύετο σὺν αὐτοῖς: ἤδη δὲ αὐτοῦ οὐ μακρὰν ἀπέχοντος ἀπὸ τῆς οἰκίας, ἔπεμψεν φίλους ὁ ἑκατοντάρχης λέγων αὐτῷ: Κύριε, μὴ σκύλλου: οὐ γὰρ ἱκανὸς εἰμι, ἵνα ὑπὸ τὴν στέγην μου εἰσέλθῃς.

7. Διὸ οὐδὲ ἑμαυτὸν ἤξιωσα πρὸς σέ ἐλθεῖν: ἀλλ' εἰπέ λόγῳ, καὶ ἰαθήτω ὁ παῖς μου.

9. Καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπός εἰμι ὑπὸ ἐξουσίαν τασσόμενος, ἔχων ὑπ' ἑμαυτὸν στρατιώτας: καὶ λέγω τούτῳ, Πορεύθητι, καὶ πορεύεται: καὶ ἄλλῳ, Ἐρχου καὶ ἔρχεται, καὶ τῷ δούλῳ μου, Ποίησον τοῦτο καὶ ποιεῖ.

8. Καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπός εἰμι ὑπὸ ἐξουσίαν τασσόμενος, ἔχων ὑπ' ἑμαυτὸν στρατιώτας: καὶ λέγω τούτῳ, Πορεύθητι, καὶ πορεύεται, καὶ ἄλλῳ, Ἐρχου, καὶ ἔρχεται, καὶ τῷ δούλῳ μου, Ποίησον τοῦτο, καὶ ποιεῖ.

10. Ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐθαύμασεν, καὶ εἶπεν τοῖς ἀκολουθοῦσιν, Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν παρ' οὐδενὶ τοσαύτην πίστιν ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ εὑρον.

9. Ἀκούσας δὲ ταῦτα ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ἐθαύμασεν αὐτόν, καὶ στραφεὶς τῷ ἀκολουθοῦντι αὐτῷ ὄχλῳ εἶπεν, Λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐδὲ ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ τοσαύτην πίστιν εὑρον.

11. Λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν, ὅτι πολλοὶ ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν καὶ δυσμῶν ἔξουσιν, καὶ ἀνακλιθήσονται μετὰ Ἀβραάμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν.

12. Οἱ δὲ υἱοὶ τῆς βασιλείας ἐκβληθήσονται εἰς τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον· ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων.

13. Καὶ εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῷ ἑκατοντάρχη· Ὑπάγε, ὡς ἐπίστευσας, γενηθήτω σοι· καὶ ἰάθη ὁ παῖς ἐν τῇ ὥρᾳ ἐκείνῃ.

5. And when he was entered into Capharnaum, there came unto him a Centurion, beseeching him,

6. And saying: Lord, my servant lieth in the house sick of the palsy, grievously tormented.

7. And he saith unto him: I will come and heal him.

8. And the Centurion answered and said: Lord, I am not worthy that thou shouldest come under my roof: but only say the word, and my servant shall be healed.

10. Καὶ ὑποστρέψαντες εἰς τὸν οἶκον, οἱ πεμφθέντες εὗρον τὸν δοῦλον ὑγιαίνοντα.

1. After he had ended all his sayings in the ears of the people, he entered into Capharnaum.

2. And a certain Centurion's servant, who was dear unto him, was sick and at the point of death.

3. And when he heard concerning Jesus, he sent unto him elders of the Jews, asking him that he would come and save his servant.

4. And they, when they came to Jesus, besought him earnestly, saying: He is worthy that thou shouldest do this for him:

5. For he loveth our nation, and himself built us our synagogue.

6. And Jesus went with them. And when he was now not far from the house, the Centurion sent friends to him, saying unto him: Lord, trouble not thyself: for I am not worthy that thou shouldest come under my roof:

7. Wherefore neither thought I myself worthy to come unto thee: but say the word, and my servant shall be healed.

9. For I also am a man under authority, having under myself soldiers: and I say to this one: Go, and he goeth; and to another: Come, and he cometh; and to my servant; Do this, and he doeth it.

8. For I also am a man set under authority, having under myself soldiers: and I say to this one: Go, and he goeth; and to another: Come, and he cometh; and to my servant, Do this, and he doeth it.

10. And when Jesus heard it, he marvelled, and said to them that followed: Verily I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel.

9. And when Jesus heard these things, he marvelled at him, and turned and said unto the multitude that followed him: I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel.

11. And I say unto you, that many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of Heaven:

12. But the sons of the kingdom shall be cast forth into the outer darkness: there shall be the weeping and gnashing of teeth.

13. And Jesus said unto the Centurion: Go thy way; as thou hast believed, so be it done unto thee. And the servant was healed in that hour.

10. And they that were sent, returning to the house, found the servant whole.

In the ninth verse of the text of Matthew, *τασσόμενος* is omitted in many codices, and in the Syriac, Armenian, Ethiopian, and Gothic versions. It is found in **N** and **B**, and in many codices of the *Vetus Itala*. It is probable that the term was interpolated here from the text of Luke.

In the tenth verse, we find the reading *παρ' οὐδενί* in B and in some cursive MSS. This reading is followed by the Sahidic, Bohairic, Syriac, and Ethiopian versions. In Verse twelve, Tischendorf approves the reading *ἐξελεύσονται* of \aleph^* . This reading is also followed by the Syriac versions. The reading *ἐκβληθήσονται* has the authority of the other Greek codices, and of the Vulgate, Sahidic, Bohairic, and Gothic versions. In the thirteenth verse of Matthew, in \aleph^* , C, E, M, U, X, et al., an additamentum is found very similar to Luke VII. 10.

In the first verse of the text of Luke we find the reading *ἐπειδή* in A, B, C*, X, and Π. It is endorsed by Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort. The other authorities support *ἐπεὶ δε*. In Verse seven of Luke B and L support the reading *ιαθήτω*. This is approved by Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort. Some other authorities support the reading *ιαθήσεται*.

In the tenth verse of Luke, the greater number of authorities qualify the term *δούλον* by the term *ἀσθενοῦντα*. Such term is omitted from \aleph , B, and L, and from the Coptic, from the Sinaitic MSS. of Syriac Gospels, and from the Jerusalem Syriac. It is also rejected by Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort.

Though there are certain points of divergency in these two passages, it is evident from the broad general identity of theme, that they both deal with one and the same event. The place, the persons, the faith and humility of the centurion, and the action of Jesus are the same in both cases. We have first, therefore, to review the event in all its elements, and then pass to the consideration of the moral lessons deducible from it.

The city of Capharnaum was at the date of the event under the government of Herod Antipas; and a detachment of soldiers were stationed in the city. The Centurion held a command in this military body. He was a Gentile, as plainly appears by many proofs in the account. The ancients of the Jews, in presenting the Centurion's petition, call attention to the fact that he loved *their* nation, and had built *their* synagogue; and Jesus himself contrasts the faith of the Centurion with the faith of Israel. These facts render it certain that the Centurion was a Gentile. At the same time, he must have been

a believer in the true God. The fact that he favored the Jewish nation, and had built their synagogue, proves that he held in reverence the God of Israel. He may not have been a real proselyte. In fact, it seems from the account that he was not, in the official sense, a proselyte to Judaism, but he certainly believed in Yahveh and in Christ. We must remember that God never abandoned the world or any portion of it; and in the wondrous ways of God's mercy and grace there was a way open even during the night of paganism for a good man to enter into proper relations with the one true God.

This Centurion must have been a good man. He had heard of the miracles of Christ, and believed that Christ was sent by God. Of course, it is not to be thought that the Centurion knew all the doctrine of the Incarnation and the Trinity at that time, but his heart was right, and he accepted Christ as the representative of the Most High.

And this Centurion had a servant who was dear to him. The relations existing between master and servant in those days can scarcely be understood by our people. In those days the master sometimes was as a father to the servant.

The Greek term *ἤμελλεν τελευτᾶν* signifies that death was naturally inevitable. And the Centurion, in his great sorrow at his loss, thinks of the great Prophet of the Most High who is actually in Capharnaum. The Centurion may have heard of the cure of the leper, of the cure of the demonized man in the synagogue, of the cure of the paralytic let down through the roof. Even tidings may have reached him of the cure of the man in Jerusalem, at the Pool of Bethesda.

But how shall he approach the great Prophet? The Centurion is an alien. What right has he to receive anything from the Prophet of the Jews? Then he thinks of leading men among the Jews who are friendly to him. He will ask them to intercede for him with the great Prophet; that through consideration for them, the Christ may have mercy on the infirm servant.

The ancients of the Jews, eager to perform a kind office for the benefactor of their race, go readily, and with great earnestness address a petition to the Christ, to come down and heal the Centurion's servant.

It must be noted at this juncture that the Centurion did not express a wish, or entertain a hope, that Jesus Christ would come in person to his dwelling. We must hold this, or his subsequent words and action involve a contradiction. But the ancients of the Jews, in their eagerness to procure for him the benefit, directly asked Jesus to come to the domicile of the sick man.

At this point a grave difficulty confronts us, to make the account of Luke accord in substance with the account of Matthew. Indeed, so weighty is this difficulty that some have judged that the two Evangelists do not treat of the same event.

The chief point of divergence between the Evangelists is in the fact that Matthew declares that the Centurion himself approached Jesus, and asked of him the cure of his servant; whereas Luke informs us that the Centurion, reputing himself unworthy to approach Jesus, sent a delegation of the ancients of the Jews to ask the benefit from Jesus.

The writers of the New Testament in describing words or events are only concordant in the substance of the narration. They used their human faculties in acquiring their data, and relied upon their memory to reproduce what they had seen and heard. Now the Holy Ghost by the divine influence of inspiration did not put the words ready made into their mouths, nor exempt their human faculties from the limitations proper to their nature. Divine inspiration effected that they all in their own words and manner of speech should communicate the substance of the message. In this they could not err. Matthew, Mark, Luke and Paul describe the institution of the Blessed Sacrament, and every one differs from the others in the words, though they agree in the substantial truth. They were perfectly free in the choice of words, and the arrangement of the details, provided that they conveyed the basic truth which it was the mind of God to deliver to man. So in the present instance, the substantial truths of the narration are the petition of the Centurion, his humility and faith, and the effect wrought by Jesus. These are given us in substance by both writers, although Luke is the more accurate in describing the details. We shall see that at some juncture of the event, the Centurion spoke face to face with Jesus and manifested the grand qualities

of humility, and faith which won the commendation and the benefit from Jesus. It is also true that a petition was directed to Jesus from the Centurion. Matthew takes these data and succinctly groups them together, being mainly intent to bring out the dogmatic and moral import of the event. Luke, in conformity with his general plan expressed in his proem, is careful to give the order of succession of the details of the event.

Inasmuch as the substance of Matthew's account is in Luke, together with a more accurate statement of details, we shall follow point by point the text of Luke.

Jesus had granted the petition of the Jews who came to plead for the Centurion's servant, and he was returning with them, when tidings were brought to the Centurion that the great Prophet was coming to his house. And the Centurion is troubled at this, reputing himself unworthy of such a great honor. Hastily summoning some of his friends, he goes out to meet Jesus, to declare that he had not asked a personal visit from him. The account of Luke seems to imply that the Centurion's words were delivered to Jesus by the Centurion's friends, and there is recorded in Luke no personal address of Jesus to the Centurion. But Matthew's account gives such prominence to the Centurion's declaration to Jesus, and also brings out in such strong relief the address of Jesus to the Centurion, that we are forced to believe that a personal interview took place between Jesus and the Centurion, while Jesus was on his way to the bedside of the sick man. The order of events seems to be that the Centurion himself accompanied the second delegation of friends who went to meet Jesus. The Centurion feeling unworthy personally to approach Jesus employs the friendly offices of the Jews to declare his will to the Christ. But in the affair it is brought about in some way that Jesus and the Centurion meet face to face, and the texts of both Evangelists record the words of the interview that took place between them. These words constitute the grand leading theme of the whole event, and it is with these that we have now mainly to deal.

The first proposition of the Centurion expresses a deep sense of humility. No soul can be acceptable to God without

this virtue. It disposes the soul to receive the operation of divine grace, and its defect shuts the way of access to God in the soul. The defect of humility lost Heaven to the angels. Humility is wisdom. It is the wise recognition of the nature of the creature and the nature of the Creator, and the fixed relations that exist between them. Humility is not opposed to greatness of soul, but it is opposed to falsehood and pompous self-conceit. It is not humility to try to convince one's self that one has not gifts of body or mind which really exist. It is not against humility to rejoice in the consciousness of the possession of such gifts. It is humility to recognize that, though these attributes of one's being may seem great to human eyes, compared to the attributes of God, they are nothing. It is humility to recognize that what we can not understand is not therefore false; to recognize that our intellects are limited, and God's truth is infinite. Thousands are going away from Christ, and staying away from Christ for the reason that a defect of humility moves them to reject that which they can not understand. Perhaps unconsciously to themselves they have given to their finite intellects an equality with the infinite God. No man thus minded can come at the truth or hold to the truth: "God resisteth the proud, but giveth grace to the humble."

It is not against humility to love one's self; man must love himself. But it is against humility to love one's self exclusively; to lay claim to a pre-eminence that is an usurpation. Pride is a terrible sin; because it assails in a measure the sovereignty of God, and attacks the plan of God. Humility moves a man to accept cheerfully the wise decrees of God. Humility is truth; pride is falsehood. It is not the object of humility to abase us; it is to raise us. The true elevation, the essential, eternal elevation is the elevation of merit, the elevation of virtue.

Nobility of origin, intellectual power, wealth, are nothing before God. What is the birth of a creature of earth before God who made the angels? What is genius before God who is infinite mind? who comprehends eternity and infinity? What is wealth before God who made the world? Evidently nothing. Whatever we have of good, and whatever goodness may be in

us came to us from God. Hence does St. Paul say: “— and what hast thou that thou didst not receive? but if thou didst receive it, why dost thou glory as if thou hadst not received it?”—I. Cor. IV. 7.

Humility stills the wild passion of egotism in man, and sobers him, so that he can hear the voice of God. So great was the world's need of humility that “Christ Jesus, being in the form of God, counted it not a thing to be grasped to be equal to God, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men; and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, becoming obedient unto death, yea, the death of the cross.”

This is the grand model of humility. No being could be higher; no being could descend so low. If humility entails renunciation, think of the grand renunciation of the Son of God. How eagerly we clutch at every right, honor, or privilege which we think due us from any title? And yet the Son of God who had the right as man to the honor due the Son of God, laid aside this right, and died naked on a cross between two crucified thieves, mocked and insulted by the lowest rabble of Jerusalem. If any man takes from us the least honor or advantage how we resent it? And Jesus voluntarily emptied himself of the glory of his Father, yea, and did thus to teach us the great lesson of humility. Jesus invites us to follow him, and the following of him implies the doing of the things that he did, and he was supremely humble.

The Lord Jesus possessed an essential inherent right to be honored, as man, as the co-equal Son of God. He could have asserted this right, and could have justly received this honor. And he made himself the lowest of all. We have no essential right to anything. We are essentially dependent, dependent on God for the very act that holds our being from falling into the awful void of absolute nothingness, and we would be proud. It is no condescension on our part to be humble, for we have nothing absolutely our own; we exist only by the good pleasure of God.

This conception of humility needs not destroy grand aspirations. There is a greatness for the creature, which may be lawfully sought after and possessed. We are only forbidden

to long for a greatness that is founded on falsehood and usurpation. The greatness of truth, of moral goodness, the greatness which God judges to be greatness is open to us. We have an infinite world of achievements open to us, where we may realize all the best longings of human nature. The achievements of that world will bear the scrutiny of God, the test of eternity. No limit is set to the heights to which we may ascend. There are no disappointments in that world, no fallacious hopes. We shall inevitably receive that for which we have labored, and the greatness of the prize will be proportioned to the greatness of the endeavor.

It is good to have grand aspirations; it is good to reach up to something grand and noble. Pride distorts this reaching up of the soul, and directs it to the false, ephemeral baubles of this world; humility simply directs the soul's course aright, and makes it fasten itself to a good worthy of the high nature of man. Pride is the vice of mean, superficial souls. Truly great men are always humble. Great wisdom and knowledge open a man's mind to realize what he is, what nature is, and what the God of nature is. They impress on a man's soul how limited are his attributes in comparison to what is in nature and above nature.

It is said of Socrates that he went forth one morning from his tent, seated himself, and became absorbed in thought. The sun rose and set. The voices of a thousand men encompassed him. The horsemen filed past into the plain; the hum and bustle of an army resounded through the day. But the sage moved not. And when the philosophers of Greece bade him speak, after the long meditation, he answered them: "What do ye know?"

Yea, children of men, what do ye know? Ye have passed over the seas; ye bring over the submissive surface of the deep the wealth of many lands. Ye have tracked the stars, and ye write down beforehand their occultations, their disappearance and their return. The earth trembles at the shock of your engines of war; the lightning's subtle force is your servant. This knowledge and these achievements seem mighty to man, but do they solve the enigma of human life? What do you know of yourself? of your destiny? of eternity? of whence we

have come, and whither we are going? Every man who relies on reason, stops here, and can go no farther. It is the limit of human intelligence.

But is it therefore all dark? By no means; not by the light of unaided reason; not by the sages of Greece; but by the light which descended from Sinai and from Calvary, and by the word which came from on high through the shepherds of Israel, has the mystery of human life been cleared up as far as the nature of our present life demands.

Finally, the virtue of humility ought greatly to be practised on account of the promises of God to the humble, and God's denunciations of the proud. Christ says by the mouth of Luke XIV. 18: "— who humbleth himself shall be exalted." Again by Matthew XVIII. 4: "Whosoever shall humble himself as this little child, the same is the greatest in the kingdom of Heaven." Eternal greatness is directly proportionate to earthly humility. The inspired author of the Book of the Wisdom of Jesus the son of Sirach thus says XXXV. 21: "The prayer of him that humbleth himself shall pierce the clouds." Solomon saith, Prov. XXIX. 23: "A man's pride shall bring him low; but the humble man shall obtain honor." The Holy Ghost speaks by the mouth of Judith, IX. 16: "— nor from the beginning have the proud been acceptable to thee: but the prayer of the humble and the meek hath always pleased thee." St. Peter saith, I. V. 5: Yea, all of you, gird yourselves with humility, to serve one another: for God resisteth the proud, but giveth grace to the humble. Humble yourselves therefore under the mighty hand of God, that he may exalt you in due time." Humility brings God near; pride drives him away.

After the created humanity of Jesus Christ, the most perfect of God's creatures is the Mother of God; and she stands before the world matchless in her humility, and gives expression to the greatness of this virtue in her everlasting canticle: "He hath put down princes from their thrones, and hath exalted them of low degree."

Thus we shall ever find it. Those who have most cause to glory, are least inclined to do it. This may be illustrated by a simple example. If we look upon a field of ripened grain,

we shall see certain heads standing stiffly upright and others drooping low. On examination we shall find that the drooping heads contain fine plump kernels of grain, and many of them, while the heads that thrust themselves ambitiously above the others contain only chaff, or a few shrunken and shriveled kernels.

Solomon declares, Prov. XI. 2, that "with the humble is wisdom," and [Prov. XV. 33] that "before honor goeth humility." The Lord has promised to humble the proud, and exalt the humble, and he will do it. The saints of God have all been humble, and the greatest saints have been the most humble. Humility is an evidence that a man has a mind large enough to rise above the vainglory and pomp of the world, and apprehend the true and immutable glory which God is willing to give to his creature. The wisest of the Greeks acknowledged that his title to be called a wise man lay in the fact that he knew that he knew nothing.

The great question now to be addressed to our soul is: Are we humble? "Humility is one of the most difficult of virtues, both to attain and to ascertain. It lies close upon the heart itself, and its tests are exceedingly delicate and subtle." The ancients had not the idea, and had no word to express it. The term "*humilitas*" with the Latin people was a term of reproach. Many counterfeit humility. They affect a low position, while they cherish an idea of their own importance. They will condescend to an inferior, because it is an evidence of good breeding, and the eye of man will approve it. It is modesty, a winning virtue, a gracious charm of deportment. It inspires propriety in deportment, refinement in conduct. It is perfectly compatible with pride, for there is no interior abdication of what pride may move a man to repute himself to be. True humility is to relinquish in our very heart of heart the false idea of the importance of self; not relinquish the idea of the importance of self, but the *false idea* of the importance and prerogatives of self; to feel our true rank and place in the scale of being.

But greater than the humility manifested by the Centurion's words is the faith of his soul by them revealed. The Lord Jesus had consented to go down to his house, and was, in

fact, on the way thither when the Centurion meets him, and says in effect: "Why shouldest thou go to my house? The infinitude of thy power is not subject to space. Thou needest not go to the place where the effect is to be wrought, for thy power filleth the universe. I come at a partial realization of thy power by contrasting it with mine. I am a man clothed with a little authority, a mere subaltern in the army. My power is subordinate, limited, small. But yet I am obeyed by my soldiers and servants. But thou art the sovereign Lord of Heaven and earth. Above thee there is no higher power, and with thee is all power. And as I, poor, weak man, can command and obtain obedience, much more canst thou command the universe and all its forces, and be obeyed."

The words convey one of the finest expressions of faith ever uttered. Jesus was a reader of hearts, and he saw that the words were a true expression of the man's thought, and turning to the throngs that followed him Jesus openly proclaimed that the faith of this alien was greater than he had found in Israel.

The Lord here compares like with like. Hence there is no question of comparing the faith of the centurion with the faith of the Blessed Virgin. Hers was greater. No mere creature of earth can rightly be compared to her in any perfection. By her matchless prerogative of Mother of God, she, in a certain sense, left the plane of ordinary creatures; and when men are compared with men she is exempt and raised above the subjects of comparison. The Lord therefore merely says that in his public life among the chosen people of God he had found no faith so firm and absolute as that possessed and proclaimed by the Centurion.

Both Evangelists concur in declaring that Jesus wondered, *ἐθαύμασεν*, at the sublime faith of the Centurion. Wonder is a feeling arising from the perception of something new, strange and unknown. Preceding knowledge of anything precludes wonder thereat. Now as Christ possessed all knowledge, it, at first sight, seems strange that he should wonder at this faith. But we must remember that the men who wrote down this event had not the intention to employ dialectical subtleties. They wrote plain words, according to the vulgar conception of things. What they wished to say was that the look, words, and

general bearing of Jesus indicated surprise. Neither does this indicate simulation in Jesus. The event in very truth was of a nature to cause wonder. The faith was marvellous, and the man was an alien. The divine harmony between the divine and human natures in the person of Jesus Christ allowed the human nature to act naturally, and acting naturally it marvelled at the actual existence of a truth that by infused knowledge was already known by the soul of Christ. It is not enough to say that this is *hard* to understand; it is *impossible* to understand. It is a part of the mystery of the Incarnation.

Jesus now utters a terrible prophecy. The faith of the Centurion was a noble specimen of the faith which the cause of Christ was to receive among the Gentile nations. And as the Lord by his omniscience looked down through the ages of time, he saw and foretold the formation of the Church throughout the Gentile world, and the reprobation of the Jews.

The designation of the Orient and the Occident as the places whence the many should come to sit in the kingdom of Heaven simply means the nations of the earth in contradistinction to the chosen people whose proper land was Palestine.

Yahveh founded in Abraham and his seed the chosen people of the first alliance. Abraham by his great faith merited to be considered the father of all believers. His son Isaac and grandson Jacob were also faithful to the covenant of Yahveh, and the promises made to Abraham were confirmed to them. To them was promised an inheritance, and after centuries of waiting it was given. But this earthly inheritance was only a type of the everlasting inheritance which these were to receive. It is true, that at the time that Christ spoke, not even these holy patriarchs had been admitted to the Beatific Vision, for Christ was the firstborn of the dead. But these fathers of Israel were entitled to Heaven, and their detention in Limbo could not have been a state of punishment. They simply had to wait for Christ to open the way to Heaven. Hence Christ speaks of them as though they were already in Heaven. His words canonize these three holy men. It was a forcible way to address a Jew. They gloried in their Abrahamic origin, while they were totally deficient in that which made Abraham the "friend of God." And Jesus says to them: "By faith the

nations of the world shall become the children of Abraham, as Isaac himself was begotten not by the way of human generation, but by a miracle wrought in virtue of faith. And ye who glory in that ye are of the seed of Abraham, ye who by birth had a right to the kingdom of God, ye by unbelief shall lose that right, and ye shall be cast into hell, where shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth."

It is certain that the Lord here speaks of hell. He represents the kingdom of Heaven under the figure of a banquet where the elect of all the nations of the earth sit with the holy patriarchs of Israel. Outside is dark and horrid. And the children of Israel, who would enter that banquet, are cast forth into the night of eternal death. And the figure represents that forth from that awful darkness come weeping and gnashing of teeth. The weeping indicates the pain of that existence; the gnashing of the teeth denotes the despair of the damned.

Awful words,—eternity! hell! We shall reserve for a future place in our work to treat fully of hell; we shall here speak only of the exemplary lesson of the faith of the Centurion. It obtained its object. The Centurion had shown great faith in believing that the physical presence of Jesus was not necessary to work the desired effect. Jesus rewards such faith by healing the sick man in the specific way expressed by the Centurion. Jesus went not down to the place where the sick man lay, but spoke the word, and they who had come out from the house of the Centurion, going back, found that the servant was healed in the hour in which Jesus had spoken the word.

Jesus makes the faith of the Centurion the measure of the effect: "—as thou hast believed, so be it done unto thee." This sentence of Jesus is also aimed to teach a grand moral lesson. God deals with us as he finds the heart. He gives redemption gratis; he gives graces gratis; but he must have some return for these benefits; and the degree of our co-operation will be the measure of God's rewards. Knowing this, why are we content with so little of what God loves in the human soul? Why care we not more to grow in faith? for as we have believed, so will it be done to us. If our faith has been scanty and poor, the reward of God will be proportionate.

There is some profit in comparing this Centurion's conduct with the conduct of that king's officer whose son was healed at Capharnaum.—John IV. 46—54. The Centurion was anxious to relieve Jesus of the necessity of going to the sick man, declaring that it would suffice if Jesus would command the illness to depart from the absent man; the king's officer is importunate in a demand that Jesus should come down quickly. The king's officer had less faith than the Centurion. He believed in a measure, but his faith did not reach the grandeur of conceiving Jesus as the absolute Lord of the universe, obeyed by the mighty forces of all nature, as a man in authority is obeyed by his servants. Jesus granted the request in both cases; but his treatment of both men is different. To the king's officer he revealed the weakness of his faith, when he declared. "Unless ye see signs and wonders, ye will not believe"; whereas he extols the faith of the Centurion above that of all the people of Israel. Christ worked both miracles; but that in favor of the king's officer was for the purpose of strengthening a weak, imperfect faith; while the cure of the Centurion's servant was a reward of a perfect faith.

No other virtue has received in the Gospels the encomiums and promises given to faith. This is just and right. Faith is life, supernatural life. The other virtues are vital acts proceeding from the vital principle, faith. It would be as possible for a corpse to walk, or speak, or think, as for a man devoid of faith to please God and merit Heaven. Hence does St. Paul say that "without faith it is impossible to please God." And the prophet says: "The just man shall live by faith." Faith is not the whole of the spiritual life; but it is the vital principle on which all the spiritual life is built. Now in the living organism we find that where the vital spirits abound, there is much energy,—an ability, and a disposition to act. So it is with the soul. Where faith is strong, good deeds will abound. Love will be strong; because faith makes of God and Heaven a living thought. It is true that a man can have within him a strong principle of life, and yet waste his life. He can have the power to act, and yet sit down lazily and do nothing. So it is with faith. A man can waste his supernatural life. Such would be the man who believed, and yet did not execute the good deeds

which are necessary for salvation. Hence it is an article of Catholic doctrine that faith can exist without the other elements of righteousness; but the proposition is not convertible. A man can not live in the supernatural order without faith.

Faith being such an excellent thing, it is one of the strange mysteries of this curious existence of ours that we give no more attention to have faith, and to preserve faith. A great cause of lack of faith is voluntary ignorance. Faith can not be had without a certain application of the mind. Few of us give serious thought to know God as we may best apprehend him in this world. With the many, the few elementary truths instilled into the mind in early childhood are all the religious capital that they possess. With this slight provision they go out upon the great sea of the world's life, to be buffeted by the waves of falsehood and sin, and soon there is discoverable in them evidence that the principles of the world have invaded their soul. The world of the soul becomes an abstraction. Faith teaches that the great thought of human life should be: God is; and I am. But they substitute the falsehood: Matter is; and pleasure is pleasant. Faith teaches that everything that comes to an end is worthless to the human soul, because the soul can not come to an end; and these worldly Christians in all things give precedence to the concerns of this life. Faith teaches that a few years hence all things to which we now give time and thought and labor shall have passed like the baseless fabric of a dream, and we shall be alone before God, and before us eternity; and these men cling to the prizes of this present life, as though they were the supreme good. When we contrast the service which the world receives with the service which God receives, we wonder how God can be pleased with his people.

O Christian, is there any leading theme of your life which receives so little living thought as the God who created you? You perhaps attend divine worship on Sunday, and you say prayers; but is there a soul-communion between God and you? Do you live with a consciousness that you are always in the divine presence? Do you not perhaps like Israel honor God only with your lips? or perhaps like the Athenians, build an altar to the unknown God? Your grandest attribute is mind. Without that you were as the beast of the field. The noblest

act of the mind is to know God, and yet you know him not. You prefer the low plane, where you and the brute meet on a common level, to the estate of angels. The poor savage of this land gave to the white explorers purest gold in exchange for painted tinsel and hollow glass: and you do worse; you give God, Heaven, eternal life, for the transient things which pass like snow before the face of the sun.

Men live as though this world were the grand reality, and their religion only a dream, or an untruth. The thoughts of such men will be what Plato calls mortal thoughts: they will be bounded by the horizon.

The world was always the enemy of the elect; but its prevalence has grown greatly since the thought and labor of man have invented so many things that increase sensible pleasure. And we who are commanded to hate this reprobate world, really love it, and live its life, while we weakly hold to Christ at the same time. We have no faith or a very weak faith, because our way of life generates in our souls conditions which render a being incapable of faith. Faith is not of our making. It is God's best gift to man; but we have control of the conditions which foster it or exclude it.

And these defects are found in Catholics. Of the condition of non-Catholics, let one of their own teachers make the arraignment. "For a very large class," he says, "the Church furnishes opportunity for a pleasant social life, which is in no way different from the social life of amiable intelligent people out of the Church; that is, there is nothing distinctively religious about it. For this class all the barriers and distinctions between the Church and the Godless world have been removed. Church work for them, in all its forms, is a kind of sacred amusement. Public worship, with its pulpit oratory, and modern Church music is an æsthetic entertainment. They have developed a religion which is not religious. They have learned how to be Christians, according to their meaning, without self-denial, or any abridgment of the pleasures, pursuits, or ambitions of people who acknowledge no religious obligations. . . . They do not believe the creeds which they

subscribe to when they join the Church, and generally make no secret afterward of their doubt, or disbelief respecting various fundamental doctrines of Christianity."

Such religion can move a man to no act of self-renunciation. They practice religion simply because it heightens the enjoyment of this life. Morality and social propriety add to the refined pleasures of this life; and thus they content themselves with the natural order, having no thought or desire of a supernatural order. As the means of physical enjoyment and social comfort increase, the thought and desire of the supernatural dies out of society, and the world of the senses absorbs all man's thought. Such is the world in which we live,—a perverse world, a dangerous world. And from Heaven comes the warning voice of Paul: "And be not fashioned according to this world."

Faith enters into the life of man like the purest sunlight amidst the mist and fogs of this low land. And when it is strong and right it lights up man's whole life, banishes the gloom of sorrow and death, and emancipates man from the serfdom of matter.

Very wisely the Church in her liturgy places the noble words of the Centurion in the mouth of the believing Christian who receives under the forms of bread and wine the glorified body and blood of the Incarnate God. Happy the Christian who, while he utters these words, conceives in his heart the faith and humility of the Centurion.

LUKE VII. 11—17.

11. And it came to pass soon afterwards, that he went to a city called Naim; and his disciples went with him, and a great multitude.

12. Now when he drew near to the gate of the city, behold, there was carried out one that was dead, the only son of his mother, and she was a widow: and much people of the city was with her.

11. Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ ἑξῆς, ἐπορεύθη εἰς πόλιν καλουμένην Ναὶν, καὶ συνεπορεύοντο αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὄχλος πολὺς.

12. Ὡς δὲ ἤγγισεν τῇ πύλῃ τῆς πόλεως, καὶ ἰδοὺ, ἐξεκομίζετο τεθνηκώς, μονογενὴς υἱὸς τῇ μητρὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ αὕτη ἦν χήρα: καὶ ὄχλος τῆς πόλεως ἱκανὸς ἦν σὺν αὐτῇ.

13. And when the Lord saw her, he had compassion on her, and said unto her: Weep not.

14. And he came nigh and touched the bier: and the bearers stood still. And he said: Young man, I say unto thee: Arise.

15. And he that was dead sat up, and began to speak. And he gave him to his mother.

16. And fear took hold on all: and they glorified God, saying: A great prophet is arisen among us: and God hath visited his people.

17. And this report went forth concerning him in the whole of Judæa, and all the region round about.

13. Καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτὴν ὁ Κύριος ἐσπλαγχνίσθη ἐπ' αὐτῇ, καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῇ: Μὴ κλαίε.

14. Καὶ προσελθὼν ἤψατο τῆς σοροῦ: οἱ δὲ βαστάζοντες ἔστησαν. Καὶ εἶπεν: Νεανίσκε, σοὶ λέγω, ἐγέρθητι.

15. Καὶ ἐκάθισεν ὁ νεκρὸς, καὶ ἤρξατο λαλεῖν: καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτὸν τῇ μητρὶ αὐτοῦ.

16. Ἐλαβεν δὲ φόβος πάντας, καὶ ἐδόξαζον τὸν Θεόν, λέγοντες: ὅτι προφήτης μέγας ἡγέρθη ἐν ἡμῖν, καὶ ὅτι ἐπεσκέψατο ὁ Θεὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ.

17. Καὶ ἐξηλθεν ὁ λόγος οὗτος ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ περὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ πάσῃ τῇ περιχώρῳ.

In the eleventh verse we find the reading *ἐν τῷ ἐξῆς* in A, B, E, F, G, H, L, R, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Λ, et al. **Σ***, C, D, K, M, S, Π, et al. have *ἐν τῇ ἐξῆς*. Though the second reading has in its favor the authority of the Syriac, Gothic, Armenian and Ethiopian versions, we are persuaded, from intrinsic and extrinsic evidence, that the first reading is to be preferred. In the eleventh verse many codices add *ικανολί*: it is omitted by **Σ**, B, D, F, L, and Z.

The name of the city, near whose gates this event took place, is written in the Greek text *Ναὶν*. No such city is mentioned in the Old Testament. It seems more probable that the name of the city was **נַעֲנַ** from **נָעַן**, signifying that which is beautiful. The site of the city must have been in Galilee: all the preceding and subsequent narration deals with the Saviour's work in Galilee. The tradition of the East assigns as the site of this miracle a little village at the foot of the

northern slope of the little Hermon. The village is distant from Nazareth a journey of about two hours and a quarter on horseback. It consists of a few wretched huts of semi-savage creatures. The Franciscans have erected here a chapel upon the traditional site of the miracle.

We have now to examine the miracle in all its bearings, to determine its full significance, and the motives which the Lord had in view in performing it.

In the first place, let us examine the circumstances of the miracle. It is in a public place before the gates of the city. Doubtless the city of Naim of that day was far different from the Naim of to-day. Great multitudes of the city were in the funeral cortege; for the hearts of the people were moved with pity for the widow bereft of her only son. Many disciples of the Lord were there also. The man was dead. Many had seen him die; multitudes had seen him after death. The usages and customs of the Jews had been observed in his obsequies. They had mourned over him, prepared him for burial, and now they were on the way to bury him. The Lord had not been in the city; he came upon the procession by chance; there could have been no collusion with intent to defraud.

The multitudes following the corpse and the disciples of the Lord were competent witnesses of the fact. It is certain that in the divine wisdom it was so disposed that this great number of witnesses should be present at the miracle; for it was to be one of the great proofs of the Divinity of Christ, and therefore it must be incontestable. By divine prevision the Saviour so regulated his action that the event, which happened by chance as far as depended on second causes, was by him ordained to a definite object.

Then we must look at the circumstances that invest the objects of Christ's merciful action. It is a scene well calculated to evoke in man the feeling of pity and compassion. In fact, it seems that the singularly sad character of the event caused to assemble such a large portion of the city's inhabitants. The only son of a widow was dead. Surely that weeping woman was an object of pity. Helpless, aged, and alone, she was left to drag out her years, pining over her buried hopes.

Death at all times is sad and terrible, but there are times when attendant circumstances make it doubly so; and the death of this widow's son was certainly one of the saddest of deaths.

In all the Lord's miracles there is a grand natural fitness in the subjects chosen. While ordaining the actions to prove his Divinity, he, at the same time, chose to act at such times, when men might see the eminent wisdom and mercy displayed in the effects wrought. This event was of a nature to move men to the feeling of mercy; and the Lord of the universe stood there with a human heart filled with the highest possible degree of the feelings of love and mercy. With him was power over life and death. By exercising his power he could take away the widow's grief, and, at the same time, give conclusive proof to the world that he was the Son of God. Of course, the last mentioned motive was principal, but it co-operated harmoniously with the promptings of the Lord's supereminent mercy.

The Lord's words are not like the words of men. The words of men are often hollow, meaningless, uttered for effect. Or even if they are honestly and sincerely uttered, they can console no deep sorrow, for they have not back of them the power to execute the wish expressed. But when the Lord says: "Weep not," he conveys to the person addressed the consolation that the cause of sorrow is abolished. Not to all who follow him does he address these words of consolation by direct message, but to all the elect he has promised such effect to be wrought in that better future estate which awaits them: "They shall hunger no more, neither thirst any more; neither shall the sun strike upon them, nor any heat: for the Lamb who is in the midst of the throne shall be their shepherd, and shall guide them unto fountains of waters of life; and God shall wipe away every tear from their eyes."—Apoc. St. John, VII. 16.

There are souls destined to wait even till that time before the Lord shall comfort them; but the comforting is inevitable, if one remains faithful to Christ. Such an effect is well worth the waiting for a lifetime to obtain.

And Jesus placed his hand gently on the shrouded form lying on the bier. The unusual majesty of his divine presence caused the bearers to stop. All eyes were turned on Jesus. Many of that assemblage had heard before of the works of the great prophet of Nazareth, but he had not hitherto raised any dead.

It must be borne in mind that the Jews, in the time of Christ, used no sarcophagus or coffin in the burial of the dead. The cadaver was embalmed, and invested with its winding-sheet. It was then placed on the bier, a pall was laid over it, and thus it was borne to the place of burial.

When the funeral cortege was come to the opening of the excavation or cave, the pall was removed, and the body, enveloped in its winding-sheet, was introduced into the tomb, and laid on one of the ledges or in one of the oven-shaped openings in the walls of the tomb. It was arranged decently in the grave, the bearers withdrew, and a stone was rolled upon the opening, closing it up. The body was soon decomposed; its elements returned to nature, and the white bones were left on the ledge. Into many of these caves one may enter now, and see these bleached and crumbling bones, which have lain there for indefinite generations. See *A Diary of My Life in the Holy Land*.

What a splendid preparation for a miracle! The occasion, the subject, and the circumstances were fitting. The witnesses were there, and the theme was such that the act would leave a lasting impression on their minds.

Jesus directly addresses the prostrate form of the youth: "Young man, I say to thee: Arise. And he that was dead sat up, and began to speak."

The Evangelist is careful to declare that the widow's son spoke; thereby to give evidence that he was restored to the actual possession of all his powers of body and mind. And Jesus delivered him to his awe-stricken mother. The miracle had its legitimate effect. The people recognized that Jesus acted in the power of God, and the report was spread abroad through all the country round about. But that was not the

only effect. The fact and its lesson have been operating in the world ever since. They remain for all the generations of men an absolute proof that Jesus is the Son of God.

How lightly the words sound on our lips! We learned it in childhood; we have never questioned it. We profess it in the creed every morning and every evening. But how few of us realize what such truth really imports to us? Jesus is the Son of God, and he is also the Son of Mary, and he is my Brother; he is the Son of God, and he has lived the life of man. It was good that God should give to the world the laws of righteousness; but it was better that God should live the perfect life of righteousness before the eyes of men, that the abstract law might be backed by its concrete reflection in the life of the perfect man. This Jesus did; not in a station high and unattainable to the mass of the people, but down on the plane of the poor, in the stable at Bethlehem, in the artisan's workshop at Nazareth, in the wilderness with the wild beasts, eating a piece of bread at the well of Samaria, in the humble homes of the poor, preaching to poor peasants, and sharing their life. And he has asked us to follow him. He has not merely given us a system of commands to execute, but he has given us his divine life for a model of all that is good in human life. As the loving mother first tastes of the food that she administers to her babe, to see if it be in every way fit for the delicate being which she loves, so Jesus has first experienced all the weight and the bitterness of the things to be borne by his followers.

The magnetism of Napoleon made men oblivious of danger, careless of life, patient amid fearful hardships, intensely energetic in action. And what was Napoleon? and what could he give his followers? A cruel, unscrupulous, ambitious man, upholding no moral principle; a man who left the starved and frozen bodies of his devoted followers strewn along the plains of Russia in that dreadful retreat from Moscow. And our leader is the Son of God, absolutely good, infinitely lovable, absolutely veracious, infinitely powerful. By every motive that ought to sway mind and heart he has merited our love of him, and devotion to his cause. His cause is infinitely just, infinitely merciful; it is the cause of all that is good against all that is wrong,

Christ can not fail, for he has the power that made the universe and I can not fail, if I follow him. I must suffer some things, it is true; because I am following a leader who carries a cross, and who conquers by the cross; and I am invited to do likewise. I can not fail; and every suffering is a victory under the standard of Jesus.

Christ has made to his followers brilliant promises. The mind of man is mighty in conception. Its range is vast. It can sweep across time and space, and create infinite creations in the ideal order; and yet: "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard nor hath it entered into the heart of man, what things God hath prepared for them that love him."—I. Cor. II. 9.

If a man were to say: The inheritance of the followers of Christ, as set forth in the doctrine of Christ, is too grand to be credible, he would err; but yet his statement would be reasonable. But that a man should hold with firm faith what Christ is, and what Christ has promised to his followers, and yet remain indifferent and cold in his religious life, and live the life of the world, giving to the world the substance of his time and thought, and to religion the scraps and odd ends,—this is indeed a strange and fatal folly that has deeply invaded the lives of men. How many days have we spent of which we must truthfully say that in them we have not thought anything, or said anything, or done anything that made for Christ? We receive the doctrine of Christ early in life; we may never reject it, but we stow it away as a kind of sacred relic, and we live the life of the world, as though our hopes were in nowise different from those of the pagan.

Another lesson which may legitimately be drawn from the present account is the immense benefit of the power of Jesus in its relation to us. Human life has many needs, and is exposed to many dangers. The attainment of the kingdom of Heaven is a grand and arduous achievement. Many strong agencies are operating against us. The world is a strong opposing agency, Satan is a powerful adversary, and we are impeded by the perverse law of our own members. We can not succeed without help, and that help must come from Heaven through the Son of God. If we fail, we lose everything; and if we win we gain everything. It may be decided within a day what our

eternity shall be. For every one of us this tremendous issue is pending. Every day we see around about us men dying, who have lost the aim of life, who have lost all. And what are we doing? living the life of the world, advocating the false views of an apostate world's philosophy, planning and scheming for property or position, gratifying the senses, serving Mammon or Belial. And we could have for the asking the friendship, the help, the protection of the Son of God. Verily we are worse than the base Indian who "throws a pearl away richer than all his tribe."

At our disposal is an infinite power, the power of the Son of God, the power that raised the widow's son, the power that made Heaven and earth. If I dispose myself so that power can work for me, I am saved, no being can prevent my salvation; and my salvation means endless life and happiness above the power of thought in Heaven; and yet I am thinking of other things, and am a stranger to the Son of God, who died for me.

Finally, as the widow's son died, and was borne out to burial, so must I die, and be borne on that last sad journey. I can not hope that the Son of God will meet my funeral cortege, and say to me: Arise. Many widows' sons died in Judæa while Christ was on earth, but to only one did he say: Arise. Christ's object was not merely to prolong a human life, or to take away human sorrow. His object was to prove that he was the Son of God, that by that truth the world might be saved. For this supreme scope, he selected a few fit subjects on which to operate, and the widow's son was one of these. I can not expect a miraculous return to this life, but there will come a day when I shall hear his voice, "for the hour cometh in which all that are in the tombs shall hear his voice, and shall come forth."—John V. 28. I shall arise at his voice more essentially than did the widow's son at Naim; for the widow's son arose, only to be preserved in life for some time longer, and then to die; but I shall arise to die no more. Shall I arise unto the resurrection of life or unto the resurrection of judgment? What am I doing now to insure the resurrection of life? O ye

mortals, who love life, why prize ye not everlasting life? Ye, whose hearts are so fixed to a few brief years of a troubled, careworn life, can ye not fasten your hearts to that blessed life in which sorrow, pain, and death shall have no part?

MATT. XI. 1—19.

1. Καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς διατάσσων τοῖς δώδεκα μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ μετέβη ἐκεῖθεν τοῦ διδάσκειν καὶ κηρύσσειν ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν αὐτῶν.

2. Ὁ δὲ Ἰωάννης ἀκούσας ἐν τῷ δεσμωτηρίῳ τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Χριστοῦ πέμπας διὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ,

3. Εἶπεν αὐτῷ: Σὺ εἶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἢ ἕτερον προσδοκῶμεν;

4. Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς: Πορευθέντες ἀπαγγείλατε Ἰωάννῃ ὃ ἀκούετε καὶ βλέπετε:

5. Τυφλοὶ ἀναβλέπουσιν καὶ χωλοὶ περιπατοῦσιν, λεπροὶ καθαρίζονται καὶ κωφοὶ ἀκούουσιν καὶ νεκροὶ ἐγείρονται καὶ πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται.

6. Καὶ μακάριός ἐστιν ὃς ἂν μὴ σκανδαλισθῇ ἐν ἐμοί.

LUKE VII. 18—35.

18. Καὶ ἀπήγγειλαν Ἰωάννη οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ περὶ πάντων τούτων.

19. Καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος δύο τινὰς τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ ὁ Ἰωάννης ἔπεμψεν πρὸς τὸν Κύριον, λέγων: Σὺ εἶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, ἢ ἕτερον προσδοκῶμεν;

20. Παραγενόμενοι δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν οἱ ἄνδρες, εἶπαν: Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτιστὴς ἀπέστειλεν ἡμᾶς πρὸς σέ, λέγων: Σὺ εἶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἢ ἄλλον προσδοκῶμεν;

21. Ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ ἐθεράπευσεν πολλοὺς ἀπὸ νόσων καὶ μαστίγων καὶ πνευμάτων πονηρῶν, καὶ τυφλοῖς πολλοῖς ἐχαρίσατο βλέπειν.

22. Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς: Πορευθέντες ἀπαγγείλατε Ἰωάννῃ ὃ εἶδате καὶ ἠκούσατε: τυφλοὶ ἀναβλέπουσιν, χωλοὶ περιπατοῦσιν, λεπροὶ καθαρίζονται, καὶ κωφοὶ ἀκούουσιν, νεκροὶ ἐγείρονται, πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται.

23. Καὶ μακάριός ἐστιν, ὃς ἐὰν μὴ σκανδαλισθῇ ἐν ἐμοί.

7. Τούτων δὲ πορευομένων ἤρξατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγειν τοῖς ὄχλοις περὶ Ἰωάννου: Τί ἐξήλθατε εἰς τὴν ἔρημον θεάσασθαι: κάλαμον ὑπὸ ἀνέμου σαλευόμενον;

8. Ἀλλὰ τί ἐξήλθατε ἰδεῖν; ἄνθρωπον ἐν μαλακοῖς ἡμφιεσμένο ν ἰδοὺ οἱ τὰ μαλακὰ φοροῦντες ἐν τοῖς οἴκοις τῶν βασιλέων.

9. Ἀλλὰ τί ἐξήλθατε, προφήτην ἰδεῖν; ναὶ λέγω ὑμῖν καὶ περισσότερον προφήτου.

10. Οὗτός ἐστιν περὶ οὗ γέγραπται: Ἴδού ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου δὲ κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδόν σου ἔμπροσθέν σου.

11. Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐκ ἐγήγερται ἐν γεννητοῖς-γυναικῶν μείζων Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ: ὁ δὲ μικρότερος ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν μείζων αὐτοῦ ἐστίν.

12. Ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν ἡμερῶν Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ ἕως ἄρτι ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν βιάζεται καὶ βασταὶ ἀρπάζουσιν αὐτήν.

13. Πάντες γὰρ οἱ προφῆται καὶ ὁ νόμος ἕως Ἰωάννου ἐπροφήτευσαν.

14. Καὶ εἰ θέλετε δεῖξασθαι, αὐτός ἐστιν Ἡλίας ὁ μέλλων ἔρχασθαι.

15. Ὁ ἔχων ὦτα ἀκουέτω.

16. Τίνι δὲ ὁμοιώσω τὴν γενεὰν ταύτην; ὁμοία ἐστὶν παιδίῳ καθημένῳ ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς, ἃ προσφωνοῦντα τοῖς ἐτέροις,

24. Ἀπελθόντων δὲ τῶν ἀγγέλων Ἰωάννου, ἤρξατο λέγειν πρὸς τοὺς ὄχλους περὶ Ἰωάννου: Τί ἐξήλθατε εἰς τὴν ἔρημον θεάσασθαι: κάλαμον ὑπὸ ἀνέμου σαλευόμενον;

25. Ἀλλὰ τί ἐξήλθατε ἰδεῖν; ἄνθρωπον ἐν μαλακοῖς ἱματίοις ἡμφιεσμένο; ἰδοὺ, οἱ ἐν ἱματισμῷ ἐνδοξῷ καὶ τρυφῇ ὑπάρχοντες, ἐν τοῖς βασιλείοις εἰσίν.

26. Ἀλλὰ τί ἐξήλθατε ἰδεῖν; προφήτην; ναὶ, λέγω ὑμῖν, καὶ περισσότερον προφήτου.

27. Οὗτός ἐστιν, περὶ οὗ γέγραπται: Ἴδού, ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου, δὲ κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδόν σου ἔμπροσθέν σου.

28. Λέγω ὑμῖν, μείζων ἐν γεννητοῖς γυναικῶν Ἰωάννου οὐδεὶς ἐστίν: ὁ δὲ μικρότερος ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ, μείζων αὐτοῦ ἐστίν.

29. Καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ἀκούσας, καὶ οἱ τελῶναι, ἐδικαίωσαν τὸν Θεόν, βαπτισθέντες τὸ βάπτισμα Ἰωάννου.

30. Οἱ δὲ Φαρισαῖοι, καὶ οἱ νομικοὶ τὴν βουλήν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἠθέτησαν εἰς ἑαυτοὺς, μὴ βαπτισθέντες ὑπ' αὐτοῦ.

31. Τίνι οὖν ὁμοιώσω τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης; καὶ τίνι εἰσὶν ὅμοιοι;

17. Λέγουσιν: Ἡύλησαμεν ὑμῖν
καὶ οὐκ ὥρχήσασθε, ἐθρηνήσαμεν
καὶ οὐκ ἐκόψασθε.

18. Ἦλθεν γὰρ Ἰωάννης μήτε
ἐσθίων μήτε πίνων, καὶ λέγουσιν:
Δαιμόνιον ἔχει.

19. Ἦλθεν ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώ-
που ἐσθίων, καὶ πίνων καὶ λέγουσιν:
Ἰδοὺ, ἄνθρωπος φάγος καὶ οἶνοπό-
της, τελωνῶν φίλος καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν,
καὶ ἐδικαιώθη ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων
(τέκνων) αὐτῆς.

1. And it came to pass,
when Jesus had made an end
of commanding his twelve dis-
ciples, he departed thence to
teach and preach in their
cities.

2. Now when John heard
in the prison the works of the
Christ, he sent by his disciples,
and said unto him:

3. Art thou he that cometh?
or look we for another?

32. Ὅμοιοι εἰσιν παιδίοις τοῖς
ἐν ἀγορᾷ καθημένοις, καὶ προσφω-
νοῦσιν ἀλλήλοις, ἃ λέγει: Ἡύλη-
σαμεν ὑμῖν, καὶ οὐκ ὥρχήσασθε:
ἐθρηνήσαμεν καὶ οὐκ ἐκλάυσατε.

33. Ἐλήλυθεν γὰρ Ἰωάννης
ὁ βαπτιστής, μὴ ἐσθίων ἄρτον μήτε
πίνων οἶνον, καὶ λέγετε: Δαιμό-
νιον ἔχει.

34. Ἐλήλυθεν ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ ἀν-
θρώπου, ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων: καὶ λέ-
γετε: Ἰδοὺ, ἄνθρωπος φάγος καὶ
οἶνοπότης, φίλος τελωνῶν καὶ ἁμαρ-
τωλῶν.

35. Καὶ ἐδικαιώθη ἡ σοφία
ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς.

18. And the disciples of
John told him of all these
things.

19. And John calling unto
him two of his disciples sent
them to the Lord, saying:
Art thou he that cometh, or
look we for another?

20. And when the men
were come unto him, they said:
John the Baptist hath sent us
unto thee, saying: Art thou
he that cometh, or look we for
another?

21. In that hour he cured
many of diseases and plagues
and evil spirits; and on many
that were blind he bestowed
sight.

4. And Jesus answered and said unto them: Go your way and tell John the things which ye do hear and see:

5. The blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, and the dead are raised up, and the poor have good tidings preached to them.

6. And blessed is he, who-soever shall find no occasion of stumbling in me.

7. And as these went their way, Jesus began to say unto the multitudes concerning John, What went ye out into the wilderness to behold? a reed shaken with the wind?

8. But what went ye out for to see? a man clothed in soft raiment? Behold, they that wear soft raiment are in kings' houses.

9. But what went ye out to see? a prophet? Yea, I say unto you, and much more than a prophet.

10. This is he, of whom it is written: Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, who shall prepare thy way before thee.

11. Verily I say unto you: Among them that are born of women there hath not arisen a

22. And he answered and said unto them: Go your way and tell John what things ye have seen and heard; the blind receive their sight, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, the poor have good tidings preached to them.

23. And blessed is he, who-soever shall find no occasion of stumbling in me.

24. And when the messengers of John were departed he began to say unto the multitudes concerning John, What went ye out into the wilderness to behold? a reed shaken with the wind?

25. But what went ye out to see? a man clothed in soft raiment? Behold, they who are gorgeously apparelled, and live delicately, are in kings' courts.

26. But what went ye out to see? a prophet? Yea, I say unto you, and much more than a prophet.

27. This is he of whom it is written: Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, who shall prepare thy way before thee.

28. I say unto you: Among them that are born of women there is none greater than John:

greater than John the Baptist:
yet he that is but little in the
kingdom of Heaven is greater
than he.

12. And from the days of
John the Baptist until now the
kingdom of Heaven suffereth
violence, and men of violence
take it by force.

13. For all the Prophets
and the Law prophesied until
John.

14. And if ye are willing
to receive it, this is Eliah,
who is to come.

15. He that hath ears to
hear, let him hear.

16. But whereunto shall I
liken this generation? It is
like unto children sitting in
the market-places, who call
unto their fellows,

17. And say: We piped
unto you, and ye did not dance;
we wailed, and ye did not
mourn.

18. For John came neither
eating nor drinking, and they
say: He hath a devil.

19. The Son of man came
eating and drinking, and they
say: Behold, a gluttonous
man, and a winebibber, a friend
of publicans and sinners! And
wisdom is justified by her
children.

yet he that is but little in the
kingdom of God is greater
than he.

29. And all the people
when they heard, and the pub-
licans, justified God, being bap-
tized with the baptism of John.

30. But the Pharisees and
the lawyers rejected for them-
selves the counsel of God, being
not baptized of him.

31. Whereunto then shall
I liken the men of this genera-
tion, and to what are they like?

32. They are like unto
children that sit in the market-
place, and call one to another;
who say: We piped unto
you, and ye did not dance; we
wailed, and ye did not weep.

33. For John the Baptist is
come eating no bread nor
drinking wine; and ye say:
He hath a devil.

34. The Son of man is
come eating and drinking; and
ye say: Behold, a gluttonous
man, and a winebibber, a friend
of publicans and sinners!

35. And wisdom is justified
of all her children.

There is an important variant in the second verse of the text of Matthew. **Σ**, B, C*, D, P, Z, Δ; 33, 124 have *διὰ τῶν μαθητῶν*. This is approved by Tischendorf, Westcott, and Hort. It is also followed by the Syriac, Armenian and Gothic versions. We find the reading *δύο τῶν μαθητῶν* in C³, E, F, G, K, L, M, S, U, V, X, Γ, Π, et al. This reading is followed by some of the codices of the Vetus Itala, and by the Vulgate, Coptic, and Ethiopian versions. Now we know from the parallel passage of Luke VII. 19, that the disciples sent by John the Baptist to Christ were two. But still we believe that the original reading of Matthew was *διὰ*, for the following reason. If in the beginning the reading *δύο* had stood in Matthew, no scribe would have changed it. There would have been no motive to change the plain and concordant reading *δύο* into the harsh reading *διὰ*. But on the other hand, it is easy to see how the copyists seeing the harsh idiom *διὰ*, and perceiving that it differed from Luke, corrected the fancied error, and made the texts agree. It is evident that the use of *διὰ* in this sentence is a Hebraism.

In the eighth verse of Matthew we find *μαλακοῖς ἱματίοις* in C, E, F, G, K, L, M, P, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Π, et al. This reading is followed by the Syriac versions, and by the Coptic, Armenian, Ethiopian, and Gothic versions. *ἱματίοις* is omitted by **Σ**, B, D, Z, and 47, and this reading is followed by many codices of the Vetus Itala, by the Vulgate, and some Fathers. It is a matter of no importance, since the term must be understood where it is not expressed.

In the ninth verse the order of the two terms is *προφήτην ἰδεῖν* in **Σ***, B, Z. Origen and Chrysostom approve this reading, as also the critics Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort. In all the other authorities the order of the two terms is reversed, and their reading agrees with the parallel passage of Luke.

In the tenth verse *γάρ* is omitted by **Σ**, B, D, Z; it is expressed by all the other uncial codices. The other authorities are about equally divided for and against it.

In the fifteenth verse B, D, 32 and K omit *ἀκούειν*. Tischendorf, Westcott, and Hort also omit it. The other authorities all retain it, and it is found in the parallel passages of Mark and Luke.

In the sixteenth verse of Matthew, D has ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ. This reading is followed by the Vetus Itala, Vulgate, Syriac, Armenian, Ethiopian and Gothic versions. The plural ἀγοραῖς is found in B, **N**, Z, et al. In many codices we find in the same verse the reading τοῖς ἐτέροις: in G, S, U, V, we find τοῖς ἐταίροις, which is followed by the Vulgate, Syriac, Armenian, and Ethiopian versions.

In the second member of the seventeenth verse many codices insert ὑμῖν, but it is omitted by **N**, B, D, and Z.

In the nineteenth verse of Matthew a very important variant exists. The reading ἔργων is found in **N**, B*, and 124. It is followed by the Coptic and Peshitto versions, and is endorsed by Tischendorf. B², and nearly all the other uncial codices have τέκνων, which is followed by the Vulgate, the Syriac of Cureton, the Gothic, the Ethiopian, and the best codices of the Armenian. This reading is also endorsed by Origen, Chrysostom, and other Fathers. We shall give our opinion of the various readings in the exegesis of the verse.

In the nineteenth verse of the text of Luke, B, L, R, and Z have πρὸς τὸν Κύριον: the others have πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν. In the same verse, B, L, R, and Z have ἕτερον, where the others have ἄλλον.

In the twenty-eighth verse of Luke, A, E, G, H, S, U, V, Γ, Δ, Λ, et al., add προφήτης, and βαπτιστοῦ. The Vulgate, Peshitto, and Gothic versions follow this reading. In the thirty-second verse of Luke B, **N***, and 1 have the reading ἀ λέγει. This is endorsed by Westcott and Hort. The other codices have λέγοντες or καὶ λέγουσιν.

The status of things which these passages of Scripture describe is plainly this. John is in prison by order of Herod Antipas. His earthly career is over. As we shall read later on, he will be murdered in that same prison, to please the whim of a dancing girl. We are firmly persuaded that it had been revealed to John that he was not to go forth from his prison alive. St. Paul's approaching death was revealed to Paul; and we read that such revelation was made to very many other saints, and we believe *a fortiori* that it would be made to that exceedingly noble type of sainted manhood, John the Baptist. Moved by this prophetic knowledge, John is mainly concerned

to affiliate his followers to the Christ, for whom he had been the herald. While things are thus with the Baptist, Jesus is conducting an intensely active career of preaching and miracle-working in the cities of Galilee. These cities are called in the text of Matthew "their cities"; and the pronoun plainly refers not to the disciples, but to the men of Galilee.

It is evident from the text, and also from Mark, VI. 21, that John was not kept close prisoner. His disciples were permitted to visit him, and from these he learns of the great works of the Lamb of God, whom he had baptized in the Jordan. Thereupon John elects two of his disciples, and sends them to Jesus to ask of him a plain definitive statement concerning his Divinity: "Art thou he that is to come, or are we to look for another?"

Very fitly is the Messiah called "he that is to come, *ὁ ἐρχόμενος*." This term finds a scriptural basis in Genesis XLIX. 10; Ezechiel XXI. 27; Ps. CXVIII. 26, etc. For centuries God's predestined ones had looked forward to that coming one as the sole comforting hope in a world given over to sin and to death.

We come now to the main point at issue: What was John's motive in sending his disciples to ask Jesus the aforesaid question? This is one of the very difficult questions of the Gospels. A great deal has been written upon it, most of which it is neither pleasant nor profitable to examine. We shall therefore only take up and examine some of the leading opinions.

It was the opinion of Tertullian that John had fallen into a state of doubt concerning the character of Jesus, and that in the perplexity of his doubt, he sent this embassy to seek greater evidence from Jesus. Lamy and Mansel adopt this opinion. The common opinion of protestant commentators is that John was sorely tried by temptations against faith during his long imprisonment; and they believe that the sending of the embassy is an evidence of his wavering. They point to the precedent of Moses, who after the grandest manifestations of God's existence and power, after having conversed with Yahveh on Sinai, even Moses doubted in the striking of the rock in the desert. Schegg and Schanz, though they speak guardedly, seem to incline to this opinion.

We deem it our first duty to refute this opinion, which seems to us false and pernicious, and which robs John of all the glory which by all proofs is the Baptist's due. John was a man sent by God to give testimony of the light; of what worth was his testimony, if he himself doubted? The Spirit of God told him that Jesus was the Christ, and the revelation had been confirmed by the descent of the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove at the baptism of Christ. On former occasions, when the disciples of John discussed with him the character of Jesus, there is no accent of doubt in his words, as he declares that Jesus is the bridegroom, and he himself only the friend of the bridegroom. And, moreover, the occasion that prompted John to send the embassy to Jesus was the intelligence of Jesus' wonderful works, which had come to John in prison, and which was certainly of a nature to confirm his existing faith. Finally, the eulogy of John by Jesus himself, uttered after the departure of the embassy, would be absurd, if John had doubted. For doubt in the mind of John, after the evidence accorded him, would have been grievous sin; and Jesus could not have praised so highly any man who, at the very moment of receiving the praise, had given evidence of the most terrible doubt.

The doubt of Moses furnishes no reasonable foundation for the aforesaid opinion. It is true that Moses was moved by some degree of doubt in striking the rock at the waters of Meribah. For this doubt he was not permitted to enter the Promised Land, but died in the Mountains of Moab. But in the first place, the doubt of Moses did not regard the existence of God, nor the existence of God's attributes. But seeing the widespread iniquity of his people, Moses feared that perhaps Yahveh might not exercise his power in a miraculous way to give drink to an unbelieving people. It was one of those peculiar conditions of the mind which is compatible with full faith in all the essentials of religion. And Moses' punishment was in reality slight. He fulfilled his mission, and God took him before his entry into the Promised Land; but he saw that land, and knew that he had fulfilled his mission. His taking off before entering the land was a mere trifle. He had lived the full span of man's life, and he was not rejected by God.

Moses is a type of the Old Law; Palestine is a type of Heaven; Joshua is a type of Jesus the Redeemer. The Old Law conducted the chosen seed through the dreary desert of the centuries of paganism that preceded the Redemption, but it could not bring man into a full possession of life. It stopped at the entrance to Heaven, and the second Joshua brought man through baptism, of which the Jordan is the type, into the inheritance of the sons of God.

Now the case of John is different. Had he entertained the doubt of which they speak, he would have been guilty of a doubt which attacks the very foundation of the New Covenant; he would have been guilty of a doubt that would have rendered his mission abortive; for he was a voice sent by God to testify to men that Jesus was the Christ, the Son of God; and if the voice itself became uncertain, how should it beget faith in others, while itself doubted? Wherefore we conclude that every attempt to expound the passage must admit as a first principle that John the Baptist was not moved by any personal doubt concerning the Messiahship of Jesus Christ.

There remains but one way to explain the action of John; and to comprehend it fully; let us in spirit place ourselves in the prison with John. Disciples have just come to him, and they relate the mighty works of Jesus of Nazareth. They have not John's faith; they are perplexed to know what manner of man this prophet of Galilee is, who is eclipsing the glory of their master. There was always a certain party spirit in many of the disciples of John, which moved them to look with disfavor on the growing fame of Jesus.

Now John's career was practically over, and he knew it. He had been sent to draw men to Jesus, and he had fulfilled his mission well. His great aim now is to confirm his disciples in the following of Christ before leaving them. And he deliberates within himself how he may best accomplish that end. It is not enough that he knows that Jesus is the Son of God, he must make his followers firmly believe it. He has told them many a time and oft that such is the truth, but still they doubt. Perhaps they complain that Jesus has not clearly declared himself to be the Son of God. And John judges it best to send representatives of his followers to Jesus that they may have a definite proof that Jesus is the Christ.

John was not acquainted with all the designs of Jesus. They were but little together in life. The veil of mystery that enshrouded the life of the Son of God was only partially lifted to John. John himself had evidence enough for his own personal faith, but he wished for more for his followers. He knew that to men sent to Jesus in his name, Jesus would disclose all that was necessary. If he said to them that Jesus was the Christ, his words, it is true, would have the weight of a testimony; but when we consider the infinite distance that separates earth from Heaven, and that this great distance is bridged over by faith alone, we must realize what strong supports that bridge must have. John could speak and testify to the truth but the testimony of Christ "backed by the sensible and true avouch" of the disciples' eyes would be stronger; and John simply sends them to the greater source of truth. John's action is the action of a man absolutely sure of the issue; it is the action of a man impatient of the weakness of words to convey a truth, which possessed him, and which he would deliver to the whole world. In a word, we may conceive of the question being addressed to John by his disciples: "Is this Prophet of Galilee the promised Messiah?" And John answers: "Go to him in my name; see him, hear him; see his works, and ye shall nevermore doubt." Finally, the action of John was providential, for it produced one more proof in that series of proofs upon which the faith of the world rests.

We have next to deal with the conduct of Jesus towards John's disciples. The more accurate synoptist Luke tells us that Jesus at the very time of the coming of the embassy had wrought many miracles of healing of all manner of human ills. Christ based the authenticity of his mission, and his claim to the Sonship of God, not merely upon words. Any man can speak words. His words were good, for no man ever spoke as he did speak, but he asked not the faith of the world on the strength of words alone. He told the world plainly who he was, and his mission, and then he confirmed his claim by works which no man, nor no spirit can do, unless God be with him. Hence to the embassy of John he replies not by words, but asks them to receive the testimony of his deeds. Christ says to the disciples of John: "Go and relate to John what you have

heard and seen.” What they had seen related to the works of which they had been present witnesses; what they had heard related to the things testified to by others who had been eye-witnesses of them. It is quite probable that the Lord raised no dead to life before the eyes of these disciples; it is quite probable that no lepers were healed in their sight; but these deeds were done at other times, before many witnesses, and the knowledge of the deeds could be received from many *fide digni* witnesses.

In Isaiah, XXXV. 5, 6, it had been prophesied that by the power of the Messiah “the eyes of the blind should be opened, and the ears of the deaf should be unstopped,” that “the lame should leap as a hart, and the tongue of the dumb sing.” By the proving force of his works Jesus proved to the embassy of John that he was the Christ of prophecy.

Man desires to know truth, and labors to know truth. He will spend years of close persevering study to acquire the knowledge of a foreign tongue, or of the science of law or medicine, or of civil engineering. But many will not give an hour of serious, honest thought to learn aught of redemption through Jesus Christ.

Three truths are paramount in the life of man: That God the Creator exists: That the soul is immortal and destined for eternal life: And that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God. Much is dark and obscure in the life of man, but these truths are not obscure. Doubt which attacks these is wicked. The former two are confirmed by the third. It is the one eternal basic truth around which to aggregate and locate all high truths. No voice which has come to us from above is as clear, and certain as that of Jesus, and he has told us enough so that by the aid of faith we may follow him into life.

Moreover, Jesus points out to the embassy of John the Baptist not alone the proofs of his mission, which had already been given, but the whole series of his wondrous works. Some of these they saw; of some they heard from others; more they would witness, and hear of afterward. What they saw and heard were sufficient to hold them in faith till the subsequent miracles should confirm them in the belief that Jesus was the Son of God. Hence it is not necessary that Jesus at that time

should have raised any dead. It was simply necessary that his deeds should attest the residence in him of a power that could raise the dead, and that this power should at some time accomplish such effect. Jesus wished them simply to bear witness to the tenor of his public life, all of which they could not then know, but of which enough could be known to judge of the character of the whole.

It is singularly moving that the Lord Jesus should wish the character of his life to be judged from his relations to the poor and afflicted. What a lesson to the proud egotism of the world! Misery may so invade the life of man that every avenue of hope may be stopped save one. The most wretched of humanity, if he be turned away from sin, may look straight up to Heaven, and see in the merciful Redeemer his friend, a friend not oblivious of the pain and sorrow of the poor, but holding the best gifts in his hand to be given in a better existence, after the purifying fire of tribulation shall have purged away what was base alloy, and shall have left the pure gold. But on the contrary, how sad is the condition of the afflicted man who believes not? The present world has turned against him. No vision of the future world sustains him; life becomes for him an insupportable burden. What is it to live, when hope is dead? Truth moves not the intelligence; the heart is hard and without feeling. With a blank, fixed stare the despairing man looks out upon a greedy, unfeeling world. Human voices sound hollow in his ears; no friend consoles him. A sense of infinite abandonment seizes upon him. And then the journals the next morning tell of one who died by his own hand. And this phase of life grows apace; as unbelief and discontent fasten themselves upon the people.

Faith and love of God afford sure comfort in the deepest human sorrow. To the righteous man comes that sweet message from Heaven:

They that sow in tears shall reap in joy.

Though he goeth on his way weeping, bearing forth
the seed;

He shall come again with joy, bringing his sheaves."

—Ps. CXXVI. 5, 6. [Vulg. CXXV].

One of the most fatal mistakes is to seek from man's present life what it is not ordained by God to give. Man's present life is not a resting and an enjoyment: it is a painful journey to life, and peace, and happiness. It is a day's hard labor, a preparation by fire for a better existence. In tears and labor we are sowing the seed; the joy of the harvest comes not here. The hard labor of the day will be ended, the harvest of our lives will be reaped, when the Master calls us home to eternal life in his kingdom. Hence to divert our attention from the end of our lives; to fix our interest on transitory things; giving them a value which they have not, is supreme folly. Such mistaken aim causes those bitter, hopeless regrets to the man who is summoned to leave forever the things which he has loved. A voice from hell comes to us through the Holy Ghost making known the eternal remorse of those who live for this world: "Therefore we have erred from the way of truth, and the light of justice hath not shined unto us, and the sun of understanding hath not risen upon us. We wearied ourselves in the way of iniquity and destruction, and have walked through hard ways, but the way of the Lord we have not known. What hath pride profited us? Or what advantage have boastful riches brought us? All those things are passed away like a shadow, and like a post that runneth on, and as a ship that passeth through the waves: whereof when it is gone by, the trace cannot be found, nor the path of its keel in the waters: or as when a bird flieth through the air, of whose passage no mark can be found, but only the sound of the wings beating the light air, and parting it by the force of her flight; she moved her wings and hath flown through, and there is no mark afterward found of her way: or as when an arrow is shot at a mark, the cleft air presently cometh together again so that the passage thereof is not known: so we also being born, forthwith ceased to be; and have been able to show no mark of power, but we are consumed in our wickedness. Such things as these the sinners said in hell. For the hope of the wicked is as dust which is blown away with the wind, and as a thin foam which is dispersed by the storm; and a smoke that is scattered abroad by the wind; and as the remembrance of a guest of one day that passeth by."—Wisdom V. 6-15.

It is a dreadful message: it is substantially what the rich glutton asked Abraham to do, to send one from hell to testify to his kindred. But the voice obtains a limited hearing, and many will not realize that "our time is as the passing of a shadow, and there is no going back of our end: for it is fast sealed and no man returneth."—Ibid. II. 5.

The next element in the discourse that claims our attention is the statement of Jesus: "Blessed is he who shall find no occasion of stumbling in me." The greatest failure in life is the failure to apprehend Christ for what he is, and the failure to shape one's life by that knowledge. Christ came with the intention of saving humanity, and with the power necessary to accomplish such result. A conspiracy of opposing causes may work the defeat of a man's projects in everything else, save in salvation. Here a man can not fail, except by his own fault. That fault may exist in many different forms. A man may openly protest that he wants to believe, but can not. He deceives himself. He is holding something in his heart which excludes faith, and he has not the obedience of faith. Christ never abandons humanity. He is in the world to-day to do the same thing that he worked for during the years of his mortal life on earth. The same causes oppose him. Man judges by the external show of things. The world makes use of this characteristic of human souls to lead the poor dupes astray. Now mere appearances were against Christ. He professed to be the Son of God, and yet he was a man with a man's natural needs and necessities. He was born of poor parents in a humble station; he was a poor artisan's son. These facts caused many to find an occasion of stumbling in him. And many did refuse to believe in him, because they knew his humble origin. But more than all this, the occasion of the stumbling would be the period of his sufferings. It is unnecessary to state that the stumbling signifies doubt or unbelief in Christ's real Messianic character. The Apostles persevered in some kind of trust in the Messiahship of Jesus until the tragedy of Calvary was being enacted, and then was fulfilled the prediction of the Lord: "All ye shall be moved to stumble in me this night." The failure to apprehend the character of Jesus in his career of self-abasement was the great evil to which mortals

were prone; and with terrible emphasis does Jesus declare that blessed is the man who is so strong that he will not stagger at the "foolishness of the cross."

The spirit that moved man thus to stagger was the spirit of the world. It is not dead. It fails to see the sublime grandeur of God's action in the humble life of the Church. It longs for heroes who are great in the eyes of the world. It moves a man to judge by outward appearances. Men filled with this spirit would follow Jesus, while he drew from all men admiration by his signs and miracles, but when he was mocked as a fool, and beaten, and crucified, then they fled from him.

Christ is identified with his Church; his life is her life. If it were fashionable to belong to the Church, if the glory reserved for the Church Triumphant were given to the Church Militant, men would readily come into her fold. In fact, men have invented a certain counterfeit fashion of religion which is popular; it is a people's religion, an age's religion, and for that very reason to be distrusted. The rank and the intelligence, the station and the opulence of the country are professedly with this false fashion of religion. A man may go with it without self-denial or any personal abiding faith. It condemns lawlessness and vulgarity; but in it there is nothing of the supernatural, no renunciation of the world. It is a cold soulless worldliness in its most insidious form. The Catholic Church is not *popular*. Men try to proclaim that there will be finally a great popular going over to the Church. It is vain to hope for such event. The spirit of the world is not changing its character; the spirit of the world and the spirit of the Church are essentially opposed. Oft where men imagine that a popular movement is setting in towards the Church, the reality is that in individual cases the spirit of the world has so invaded the Church that the sharp lines of distinction between the Church and the world are obscured, and men draw closer to the Church, because they imagine that she is not opposed to their worldly ideas. The Church of Christ must go through the phase of Christ's mortal life of humiliation, and blessed is the man who finds not occasion of stumbling in her. Men have composed and dressed out what is the mere natural product of the human heart and called it religion, the religion of the day. They have

given this product a general coloring taken from Christianity. They use words and make professions in the language of Scripture. But this is not the religion of Christ. It is a pleasant and easy religion; all the terrors of guilt and prospective punishment are eliminated. But this is not the religion of Christ, which says: "Narrow is the gate and straitened the way that leads to life, and few there be that find it." and we must "strive to enter in at the narrow gate."

Multitudes were present when the embassy came from the Baptist. His question and Jesus' answer were of a nature to move them to believe in Jesus as the Son of God. The messengers from John now take their departure, and then Jesus, turning to the assembled multitudes, in glowing terms praises his great precursor, while he rebukes the people for their sterile admiration of John. He would not speak the praises of John in the hearing of John's disciples, for that would have the semblance of adulation; but when they are gone, he gives utterance to the finest expressions of praise that words can express.

It is a well known fact that very many went out to the Jordan to hear John. A great popular movement was excited by his preaching. It was a novel thing to go out and see this man who had lived his life in the desert, who was so austere and unworldly, who spoke such impassioned words. It appealed to the natural feeling of curiosity in man. It became a fashion in Israel to be a follower of John. But the defect was that in the great mass of those who went to hear John there was no depth of religious convictions. They listened to John while it pleased their fancy to do so, but they would not accept the Messiah of whom John was the herald. Therefore the main intention of Jesus in the following discourse is to reprehend the people for their sinful folly in showing so much activity in the great movement of John, and yet rejecting the logical and inevitable consequence to which that movement was ordered.

The Lord Jesus takes for granted that the people had been drawn to the Jordan by the intense desire to see the Baptist. In the second place, he very forcibly portrays the greatness of John. The substance of the argumentation is simple: "Ye have seen John; ye have seen that he is no creature of human

favor, no worldling; but a man of God. Yea, and I, who have the power to speak even to the heart of man, so that deception is impossible, tell you that he is the legate of the Most High; that his words are the words of God by the medium of human speech. And John testifies that I am the Messiah, the Son of God; and ye will not receive it."

In the first question of Jesus: "What went ye out into the wilderness to behold? a reed shaken with the wind?" Knabenbauer believes that the reed must be taken literally. Along the banks of the Jordan the reed was not an uncommon sight, and he believes that in sarcastic irony the Lord Jesus chides their profitless journey, as though it were as vain in effect as the idle journey of a man who had no greater object in going out than to witness a reed bending itself before the face of the wind. Schegg endorses this opinion. The common opinion of other writers accepts the words of the Lord in a metaphorical sense. The reed is a tall slender plant, very pliant, and bending readily in the direction of the wind, at the least breath of wind that acts upon it. It will move as readily in one direction as another, provided only the slightest wind blow toward that quarter. Hence it is taken as a symbol of inconstant, wavering, shifting souls, who can be easily moved in their purposes and conduct by the force of peculiar influences. While the wind blows from a certain quarter, they readily go with it; and if the wind changes its course, they change theirs.

John was not such a man. Neither does the interrogative sentence of Christ imply that such idea of John's character had at any time possessed men's minds. It is simply a forcible form of speech to assert the firm, constant, intrepid character of the Baptist. John merited in the fullest degree the epithet of "tenax propositi." He was a fit man to present to men the call of God "to do penance, for the kingdom of Heaven is at hand."

There are not many men in any age like the Baptist. When there is a great work to be done by God through human agents, God finds fitting ones to do it. He carefully selects his agent, and he gives grace commensurate to the task. Thus he called Abraham to be the founder of his chosen people; thus

he called Moses to be his lawgiver; thus he called the Blessed Virgin Mary to be the mother of his Son; and thus he called John the Baptist.

A most important work was committed to John. The vital interests involved made it necessary that a man be chosen who should do his work well; and God, who knows the hearts of all men, raised up a man equal to the need. And John most faithfully performed the work which he was called to do. There was no disappointment to God in John's work. And the men who rejected the testimony of John, did so because their hearts were evil.

We must remember that all the grandeur of the Baptist is a direct proof of Jesus' claim to be the Son of God. John was a witness whom men ought to trust, and he has testified clearly. The intention of the second interrogatory sentence of Christ is to bring out in strong relief the penitential and unworldly life of John.

The form of the question presupposes that by common consent of both speaker and hearers a negative answer has been rendered to the first question.

One of the chief ways in which the spirit of the world manifests itself is the use of fine apparel, and luxurious ways of living. John's raiment and food stand in strong contrast to what worldly men seek after. With telling emphasis the Lord asserts that a man imbued with the spirit of the world would not seek the wilderness as a habitation. We do not hold it as probable that the Lord here alluded specifically to the palace of Antipas. He is simply contrasting the pomp and pageantry of the world with the severe austerity of the Baptist. The spirit of the world surrounds itself with comforts, and shrinks from renunciation and mortification of the flesh; but John turned his back on the world and its lusts; and the spiritual side of his nature waxed strong, in its freedom from the enfeebling fetters of worldly interests. It is not necessary here to describe again the manner of John's life in the wilderness. His life has been fully described in our commentary on Matthew, III. 4, 5.

In both these questions, the Lord employs that form of speech by which a statement is strengthened by introducing a question concerning that which one wishes to deny of a subject,

in such a way that the necessity of the negative reply is implied in the discourse, and assumed by the speaker. Having now brought out some of the grand characteristics of John, he proceeds by a climax to the third interrogatory sentence, which expects an affirmative answer which he himself gives, and then strengthens it by asserting that John is something more than a prophet.

The first point to clear up here is in what sense John may be called a prophet. We have seen, John I. 23—25, that John disclaimed to be a prophet; and yet Christ clearly says that he is not only a prophet, but the greatest of the prophets. The function of a prophet in Israel was to be the spokesman of Yahveh to his people. He was usually gifted with knowledge of future events, and of things hidden from human minds. He was supreme over priest and king in dealing with the Most High.

We have seen in our commentary of John, I. 23—25, that the Pharisees asked John whether he were the great Prophet for whom Israel had long waited. As this expected Prophet was none other than the Messiah John denied that he were such prophet. Neither was John a prophet of future events, but one sent to announce a present event.

John did not belong to the series of prophets. The prophets predicted future events; John did nothing of this. His work was unique. He had received a message from God, not that the Messiah was to come, but that he was already on earth, and his sole function was to prepare for his entrance on the stage of public life, and to bear witness to the truth that Jesus was the Son of God.

But Jesus in his present affirmation accepts the word prophet in its highest sense, as an authorized legate of God, as a man commissioned by God to speak in God's name, and execute his designs among men. John was all of this, and by the exaltedness of the office which he fulfilled for Yahveh, he was greater than the other prophets.

The words of the Lord in the tenth verse of Matthew are taken from Malachi III. 1. The original reads thus: "Behold, I send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me."

The Lord adapts the prophetic words to the present theme by making them the direct utterance of the Eternal Father to his divine Son.

John the Baptist is the messenger of the Most High, sent by God for one great aim, to go before his Christ to prepare for his coming. As no decisive event of history can be compared to the Incarnation, so the sublimity of John's character is sought from the importance of the office entrusted to him by God.

The eleventh verse of Matthew, which corresponds to the twenty-eighth verse of Luke, is difficult to interpret. In the passage John is compared with all mankind, and it is declared that there is not any greater than he. There is no specific class designated by the phrase: "— them that are born of woman." It is simply an emphatic Hebrew phrase to designate humanity.

The first point to be determined is the basis of the comparison; that is to say, what entity forms the foundation of John's exaltedness among those born of woman. Some have judged this to be the personal sanctity of John the Baptist. This is the opinion of Maldonatus, who cites many Fathers as its defenders, and criticizes as heretical the contrary opinion. The advocates of this opinion exempt Christ and his Blessed Mother from the comparison. Maldonatus declares that John is only compared with the saints of the Old Law; whereas Christ and his Virgin Mother pertain to the New Law. Augustine declares that the words of Christ do not deny that any saint of the Old Law is equal to John in sanctity, but simply make John second to none of them.

St. Jerome also is of like opinion: "Christ did not prefer John before all other prophets, patriarchs, and men, but made the others not superior to John: for it does not follow, if none are greater than John, that he is greater than the others; but it is asserted that John has an equality with the others."

It seems more probable, however, that Christ did not make the basis of the comparison the personal sanctity of John, but the dignity of the office which John was called by God to perform.

Many proofs exist of the eminent sanctity of John. He was conceived by miracle, sanctified in his mother's womb, and his greatness before the Lord was foretold by inspired utterance. His life was most unworldly and holy, and Jesus certainly in the general tenor of all his remarks concerning him implies that John is a great saint. But it does not seem that, in the present instance, Christ's argumentation is based on the personal sanctity of the Baptist.

John pertained to the Old Law. He was the grandest voice in that first alliance. The prophets of old had spoken great prophecies of the Christ. They had told of his coming; of his sufferings; and of his glory. They had upheld the faith and hope of the men of that day in the coming Redeemer. But to John was given a far greater office. To him was given the sublime message to tell the children of men, not that their Redeemer was coming, but that he was come. He was chosen to baptize the Son of God; to point him out to the people, saying: "Behold, the Lamb of God, who taketh away the sin of the world."

In corroboration of the opinion which we here adopt, some adduce proof from the parallel passage of St. Luke, VII. 28, where some authorities have the reading: "Among them that are born of women there is no greater *prophet* than John." This reading is found in A, and D, and is adopted by the Vulgate, Syriac and Armenian versions. It has also good patristic authority, and is defended by Tischendorf. Of course, if the reading were authentic, it would strengthen our opinion; since in that case, John would only be compared with the preceding prophets, and the inference would be natural that the Lord is not comparing the personal qualities of John with those of the preceding prophets, but affirming the greatness of the event which the Lord was working through John. The greatness of a prophet was always measured not by the personal sanctity of his life but by the message of his words, and the power of his deeds. No prophet had ever delivered so great a message as did John in bearing witness to the Son of God, and no preceding prophet did such a great work as did John in preparing the people for the public appearance of the Son of God.

We must admit that the doubtfulness of the reading of St. Luke takes somewhat from the proof thence drawn; but yet Christ is certainly comparing John with men of like character, and his mention of John as more than a prophet naturally implies that he had them in mind in making the comparison. Hence we believe that the Lord identifies John with his mission; and that he declares that the movement of John was the most important event in the world's history up to that point. Though John's superiority over the preceding prophets is not explicitly affirmed here, we judge that it is implied by the context and general plan of the argument.

The second member of the proposition of the Lord is not less difficult than the first. It is again a question of comparison, and two difficulties confront us. First, it is not clear whom Christ means by the "lesser in the kingdom of Heaven"; and secondly, it is difficult to determine the basis of the comparison.

St. Augustine gave it as his opinion that the kingdom of Heaven in the present passage meant the universality of the angels; and he believed that the lesser one in that kingdom, spoken of by the Lord, meant the least of the angels. Hence he would interpret it that the least of the angels in Heaven is greater than John the Baptist. This opinion has no probability. There would be no point in the Lord's argument if he made such a comparison.

Bede and Jerome believe that the Lord is comparing John with the saints in Heaven. This opinion is open to the same objection as the opinion of Augustine, and moreover, it does not seem to be true that the least of the blessed is greater than John, especially as at that time none of the saints had yet entered the state of the Beatific Vision.

Much more probable is the opinion which interprets the words of Christ to be a comparison between the Old and New Testaments. John is taken as the grandest representative of the Old Testament, and is compared with a lesser in dignity in the New Covenant established by Christ; and the surpassing excellence of the New Testament is affirmed by the declaration that this lesser representative is greater than the greatest representative of the Old Testament. The least son is greater than the greatest slave: the first law was the law of fear and

bondage; the law of Christ is the law of love and sonship. This opinion in its best form does not compare the personal sanctity of John with the sanctity of the aforesaid lesser one of the New Alliance. This opinion is supported by good authority. St. Cyril of Alexandria, Tostatus, Toleti, Maldonatus, Calmet, Bisping, Schegg, Reischl, Grimm, Schanz, and Fillion advocate it. Among modern protestants Keil, Weiss, Mansel and others are cited in support of it.

The kingdom of Heaven here mentioned is the New Testament, the new salvific order of things established by Christ, in its most universal concept. Hence it embraces all the beings, and modes of being, and forces of that grand new order. This great new creation is contrasted with the Old Testament, which found its highest degree of perfection in John, who pointed out to the world its Redeemer. The first alliance did not save men; it merely led men to the coming Redeemer; and it found its fulfilment when its greatest representative announced the fulfilment of centuries of prophetic utterances.

Now when Christ entered upon the labors of his public life, John was at the zenith of his glory; and Christ was one who stood in the midst of the people, and whom they knew not. As the Baptist himself declared, Christ was to increase, while he himself was to decrease. At the moment therefore of Christ's interview with the embassy of John, Christ stood lower in glory and fame with the people than did John.

We must here remark that the Greek term *μικρότερος* in the text, being the comparative degree of the adjective, evidently imports a comparison between some being in the kingdom of Christ and St. John the Baptist; that it does not say that such person is *the least* in the kingdom of Heaven; but only that in comparison with the Baptist, such a one is lesser than he. Hence by this analysis it is plainly evident that the Lord's statement means that there is some one existing in the new order of things, who in the estimation of men was inferior to John, but who in reality was greater. This being can be no other than the Lord Jesus himself. He was in the kingdom of Christ, because he was its Creator. His creation was destined to succeed the movement of John as the daylight succeeds the dawn, or as the perfect picture of the painter is wrought upon

the lines of the rough sketch. All the greatness predicated in the present passage of John was his in virtue of the relation that he bare to the Christ; *a fortiori* therefore Christ himself was greater than his præcursor. And yet in the estimation of men he was lesser.

It is a veiled manner of speaking, but with Christ such is the usual manner of speaking of himself. A certain veil of mystery must invest his life until he should arise from the dead. It requires the after light of the grand consummation of Christ's resurrection to reveal the full significance of Christ's words and deeds. The Lord was accustomed to speak of himself in comparison with Israel's heroes, and declare his greatness over them. Thus he compares himself with Jonah and with Solomon in Matthew, XII. 41, 42. It was good to teach men this truth, for men can not know too well the exaltedness of the character of the Redeemer.

Our opinion is not deficient in extrinsic authority. It has for advocates Chrysostom, Theophylactus, Euthymius, the Opus Imperfectum, Bruno, Faber Stapulensis, Cajetan, Jansenius, Barradius, Sylveira; and among protestants, Arnoldi. Though this opinion was not adopted by Suarez, he judged it very probable.

The twelfth and thirteenth verses of Matthew furnish matter for widely divergent opinions. Parallel verses exist in St. Luke. XVI. 16. The order of the verses in Luke seems to be preferable: "The Law and the Prophets were until John: from that time the Gospel of the kingdom of God is preached, and every man entereth violently into it." One can see at a glance that Luke's presentation is clearer.

The first member of the present verse of Luke, which corresponds to the thirteenth verse of Matthew's text, makes known that at the advent of the Baptist, God adopted a new method of dealing with the world. His communication to the world hitherto had been the Law of Moses, and the subsequent inspired writings here specified under the general head of "the Prophets." These spoke of the kingdom of Heaven as a future thing; something that a man could not obtain present possession of, but for which he was bidden to hope. The Lord lays stress on the specific sense of the verb *προφητεύειν*, "to predict

future things." He thereby calls attention to the difference between the two testaments. The first testament was an economy of types and promises; the kingdom of Christ is the fulfilment of all, and the actual reality. The kingdom of Christ was properly inaugurated by John, when he pointed to the Son of God, and declared to the world that Christ was to take away the world's sin.

Hence it follows logically that man's religious obligation was different after that great event from what it had been before. In the days of prophecy, a man was right before God if he held firmly to the hope of a coming Messiah; but now that such Messiah has come and founded his kingdom, man's duty is to enter into that kingdom. Christ describes the manner of entry into that kingdom by a bold figurative use of language. He says that from the days of John the kingdom of Heaven suffers violence, and the men of violence take it by force. The passive voice of the Greek verb *βιάζetai*, which we render to suffer violence, more properly means to be carried by force or assault. The Lord is speaking of the gaining of a kingdom, and he employs military terms to describe the achievement. In the history of the world many kingdoms have been obtained by armed force, and men of might have seized them. It is an easy truth to understand. The Lord employs this well-known fact in human affairs to illustrate the manner of a man's entry into the kingdom of Heaven. Of course the language is figurative. In saying that from the days of John the kingdom of Heaven suffers violence, he means to say that since such event, it existed on earth, capable of being obtained by the assault of the men of violence. And such men were from that day conducting this assault, and thereby entering into possession of the kingdom. We must now explain the bold metaphors. The assault which takes the kingdom of Heaven is the effect of spiritual activity. Heaven is not for drones and sluggards. Its possession is a great achievement requiring thought and action. The men of violence are men of strong faith, of tenacity of purpose in the service of God; positive men, men of religious principles, men whose faith is bound up with their lives, men who have put on Jesus Christ, and whose lives are conformed to his divine life. There is no truer conception of

the Christian life than that it is a warfare requiring in the supernatural order that courage, energy, and endurance that characterize the good soldier in the wars of men.

Now the opposing forces which render an assault necessary do not come from the kingdom for whose possession we are fighting. They are foes of the kingdom and of us, and they endeavor to block our way thither. The devil is always there, and always active; the spirit of the world is there, the lust of the flesh is there, the vainglory of life is there, pleasure is there; and all these foes must be vanquished, that we may gain possession of the kingdom of Christ; and they must be kept down by valiant fighting, while we are in this phase of the kingdom's existence, else they would soon retake it, and cast us out.

It is a powerful plea for spiritual activity. A kingdom awaits man's conquest. A kingdom of whose greatness the mind of man can form no adequate idea, whose glory surpasses the power of the thought of man, can be obtained by man's activity. The achievement is possible; nay more, is certain if man will do what in him lies. Man knows the way, and the method by which to make the successful assault. In the assault he will be helped by God who created the kingdom, and if he be faithful, he can not fail. All that is required of man is honest, faithful thought and energetic action; and yet how cold man remains? how little the appeal of Christ moves him? and how easily man turns aside from the great achievement to waste the energies of his life on creatures of a day? Behold the deeds of Alexander, Hannibal, Julius Cæsar, and Napoleon! And what have they gained by that great expense of energy? the empty echo of their names on the lips of mortals. How much truer and better is the life of St. Paul, or St. John the Baptist, or St. John the Evangelist; in fact, of any of the saints of God? The present text of Scripture should stimulate us to emulate the heroes of God, and give to the acquisition of the kingdom of Heaven the best thought and energy of our being. Very little of real good is ever accomplished without a preceding struggle with the powers of evil. The present text should be a perpetual admonition that in order to be good citizens of the kingdom of Christ, there is need that we put on the armor of righteousness, and engage in a

determined warfare against the powers of darkness. The power of the world is mighty. Pleasure is pleasant; money is alluring; love of life is strong. All these forces are continually acting. If we allow ourselves to drift, we shall go with them. We must therefore put away apathy and spiritual indolence, and take the kingdom by a holy violence; by the holy violence of persistent prayer; by the holy violence of unwavering faith; by the holy violence of the subjugation of our passions, by the holy violence of renunciation and self-denial; by the holy violence of forcing ourselves to take up our cross, and follow Jesus into his kingdom.

The Lord Jesus invited to this holy violence when he declared that "he that hateth his life shall find it"; that, "If any man cometh unto me and hateth not his own father, and mother and wife, and children, and brothers, and sisters, yea and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple."—Luke XIV. 26. Here are enumerated the created objects that a man loves most. The climax is life itself. It is not without doing violence to the propensities of our nature that we place above all these things the love of God. It is by the holy violence that wins Heaven that a man leaves the pleasures offered by the world, and takes up the cross, and follows our Lord. The Apostles and the martyrs of God took Heaven by this holy violence. The sturdy soldiers of Christ in every age have risen by it to the eternal glory of the elect. It is the characteristic of men of Christian character, of men who never barter principle for advantage, of men who have a divine purpose in life, of men who in all things seek first the kingdom of God.

In Malachi, IV. 5, it is written: "Behold, I will send you Eliah the prophet before the great and terrible day of the Lord come." In virtue of that promise Israel expected that Eliah should come before the advent of the Messiah. So, for instance when John declared that he was preparing for the Messiah, they asked him if he were Eliah. There seems not to have been a clear idea in the minds of the people of the first and second coming of the Messiah. Hence it was a cause of perplexity in considering the claims of Jesus that Eliah had not yet come.

To meet this objection Christ declares that the Eliah of the first coming had come. By the modifying clause: "And if ye are willing to receive it," the Lord plainly indicates that he is not speaking in the literal sense, but figuratively. In substance he says: "What Eliah the prophet will be to me at my second coming, this is the Baptist to me now. The Baptist is a type of the real Eliah, and for all intents and purposes he fulfills for you all that the real Eliah would do, were he to come in person."

There was a great similarity in character and tenor of life between Eliah and John Baptist. Both were men of stern, unflinching devotion to duty, and noble contempt of the world. Both lived in the desert; both were girded with a leathern girdle. Both boldly rebuked a sinful generation. Eliah was forced into exile, because he sternly opposed the impiety of Ahab and Jezebel: John was imprisoned and beheaded because he rebuked Herod Antipas for his incestuous adultery with Herodias. It is a beautiful use of language to call John the Eliah of the first coming of Jesus Christ.

St. Luke relates for us the words of Jesus in which he points to the honesty and faith of the people, who readily received John's baptism; and to the hypocrisy and obstinacy of the Pharisees, and scribes or lawyers, who rejected the clear call of God. Great indeed was the sin of those leaders in Israel. It was a sin without any palliating circumstances; a sin of cold, hypocritical malice, a diabolical impugning of the known truth. This is the first clear testimony given us to prove that the Pharisees did not receive the baptism of John. They were even worse in their attitude towards Christ. They rejected him, and moved the people by falsehood and every artifice to demand his death.

The fifteenth verse of Matthew contains a usual formula of Christ to arouse his hearers to a realization of the importance of his message. The truths in the present instance delivered by Christ were very important; and he endeavors by this exhortation to move his hearers to receive this important teaching.

The Lord next proceeds to reprehend the stubborn perverseness and incorrigible obstinacy of the people of Israel,

by a comparison with the play of children. It was a fact of everyday experience that the children of any district of a city would assemble in the open space called the market place, and engage in play. The Lord contemplates a scene where there is among the children a dissension over the play. Some of the children are contrary, and will not play at anything suggested by the others. We fully believe that the reading *τοῖς ἐτέροις* is the true reading in Matthew's text. The children are divided into two classes: the children who are willing to play at anything that will please the *others*, and these *others* who are contrary, and will not play at anything. A common form of play among the children was to represent some important event in human life, such as a wedding festivity or a funeral. Now the scene represented by Christ is where the children who wish to play have endeavored to induce their playmates to take part in a play-wedding. This fails. They then run through the gamut of forms of children's play until they come to a form in character directly opposed to that first suggested, and still their playmates are obstinate, and will not play. We believe that the Lord's mention of the two forms of amusement so opposite in character implies that the children have exhausted their ingenuity to find some play that the others will accept. The scene well illustrates the hatefulness and obstinacy of the children who will not play. When the first form of play was suggested, they might be excused from wishing to engage in it for the reason that they were not in a mood for such joyous affair; but when they refuse to play anything, even the direct opposite of the play first suggested, it is an evidence that they refuse to play through mere perversity of disposition.

It is a simile taken from the play of children, but it is a powerful analysis of the obstinate infidelity of the Jews. The interrogation with which the simile is introduced indicates the indignation of the Lord who, as it were, looks about for some form of human speech capable of describing the hypocritical, unreasoning malice of the scribes and Pharisees.

The great characteristics of John's religious movement were austerity and penance. Human nature is hardly capable of greater austerity and penitential way of life than these

practised by John. He invited men to do likewise. His disciples fasted much, and held aloof from banquets. John was the last of the legates of the Old Law, which was the law of severity and fear, and his movement partook of the tenor of the covenant which had preceded. He came to an unredeemed world immersed in sin, proclaiming the necessity of repentance and works of satisfaction in preparation for the new life which should come with Christ. And the base Pharisees strove to create the impression that John's rigors of life were due to a fanaticism produced by the obsession of an evil spirit. The present text of Matthew is the only place in Scripture which certifies us that the Pharisees actually laid on the Baptist the calumny of having a devil. Only a small part has been transmitted to us of the momentous events out of which was born Christianity.

The genius of the New Dispensation is love and gentleness. It admits the elements of mortification of the flesh and penitential works, but the conception it has of God is different from that which Israel held. This new conception of God has a true basis, for the world is now redeemed.

Therefore Christ, the founder of the New Law, reflected in his relations with the people the genius of the New Law. He fasted much, and spent whole nights on the mountain in prayer; but he laid no heavy burdens on his followers. He went into their homes, ate with them, and drank with them. The ordinary life of man will never be spent in the desert, as was the life of John; and Christ wished to live the ordinary life of man, to show man how to live it. Moreover, while he was with man, he wished to draw man to love him and his law by revealing the beauty of love, which is alone sufficient.

Again, Christ went after his lost sheep wherever he found the wanderer. He repulsed not the poor sinful outcast, against whom every hand was raised. He mingled with the people, lived their life, healed their sick, forgave their sins, and drew them to love the beauty of the King and his kingdom.

Now the same hypocrites, who calumniated John for his austerity, blamed Christ for not being like John. The comparison with the children in the market place is perfect. The Pharisees stand convicted in the judgment of every honest man of a perfidy and malice having no parallel in history.

It is vain to seek in the description of the children in the market place the element that corresponds to Christ, and that which corresponds to John. Persons are not compared to persons, but event is compared to event; and thus considered, the comparison is perfect. No possible argument or evidence would have won over the opposition to the cause of Christ. They rejected Christ, because they impugned the known truth.

The concluding member of the Lord's present statement: "—and wisdom is justified by her children," is one of the obscure passages of the Gospels. The obscurity is heightened by the variant in Matthew where \aleph and B* have $\epsilon\rho\gamma\omega\nu$, while the other authorities have $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\nu\omega\nu$. The first reading is followed by the Coptic and Syriac versions, and approved by Tischendorf. But the parallel text of Luke without a variant has $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\nu\omega\nu$, the context demands $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\nu\omega\nu$, and the best authorities approve it.

In the first place, the context absolutely demands that the words be a sort of conclusion of the argument of the verse. There must therefore be a close nexus between them and that which precedes. We believe therefore that the wisdom here spoken of means the wisdom of God reflected in God's treatment of the Jewish people. The action of God is simply the actual expression of the eternal wisdom which made the universe. We believe, secondly, that the children of Israel are here called the children of wisdom. Not in the sense that they possessed the higher wisdom, but because they were the adoptive children of God, his firstborn, whom the divine Wisdom had chosen to be the most favored of all his creatures. Christ could have said: "The divine action towards Israel is justified by the conduct of God's firstborn." But the form employed by him says more in fewer words. It calls to their minds the great truth that the things that God does are effects of that mighty wisdom which gave to the universe its being, and rules it. We immediately see the sense of the passage and its appositeness here. Israel was to be punished by God with a fearful punishment. God was to turn away from her, and leave her desolate; but she could not blame him. The wisdom of God reflected in such action was justified by the conduct of his children. For

he sent his message in many ways; he spoke by his prophets, by St. John the Baptist, and most clearly of all by the mouth of his Son. They rejected all; there was nothing more to be done, but to leave them in their blindness, and desolation.

LUKE VII. 36—50.

36. And one of the Pharisees desired him that he would eat with him. And he entered into the Pharisee's house, and sat down to meat.

37. And behold, a woman who was in the city, a sinner; and when she knew that he was sitting at meat in the Pharisee's house, she brought an alabaster cruse of ointment,

38. And standing behind at his feet, weeping, she began to wet his feet with her tears, and wiped them with the hair of her head, and kissed his feet, and anointed them with the ointment.

39. Now when the Pharisee who had bidden him saw it, he spake within himself, saying: This man, if he were a prophet, would have perceived who and what manner of woman this is who toucheth him, that she is a sinner.

40. And Jesus answering said unto him: Simon, I have somewhat to say unto thee. And he saith: Master say on.

41. A certain lender had two debtors; the one owed five hundred pence, and the other fifty.

36. Ἡρώτα δέ τις αὐτὸν τῶν Φαρισαίων, ἵνα φάγῃ μετ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ Φαρισαίου κατεκλίθη.

37. Καὶ ἰδοὺ γυνὴ ἥτις ἦν ἐν τῇ πόλει ἁμαρτωλός, καὶ ἐπιγνοῦσα ὅτι κατάνκειται ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ τοῦ Φαρισαίου, κομίσασα ἀλάβαστρον μύρου,

38. Καὶ στᾶσα ὀπίσω, παρὰ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ κλαίουσα, τοῖς δάκρυσιν ἥρξατο βρέχειν τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ, καὶ ταῖς θριξίν τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτῆς ἐξέμασεν, καὶ κατεφίλει τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ καὶ ἤλειφεν τῷ μύρῳ.

39. Ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ Φαρισαῖος ὁ καλέσας αὐτὸν, εἶπεν ἐν ἑαυτῷ, λέγων: Οὗτος εἰ ἦν ὁ προφήτης, ἐγίνωσκεν ἂν τις καὶ ποταπὴ ἡ γυνὴ ἥτις ἅπτεται αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ἁμαρτωλός ἐστιν.

40. Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτόν: Σίμων, ἔχω σοί τι εἰπεῖν: Ὁ δέ: Διδάσκαλε, εἰπέ, φησὶν.

41. Δύο χρεοφειλέται ἦσαν δανειστῇ τινί: ὁ εἰς ὤφειλεν δηνάρια πεντακόσια, ὁ δὲ ἕτερος πενήχοντα,

42. When they had not wherewith to pay, he forgave them both. Which of them therefore will love him most?

43. Simon answered and said: He, I suppose, to whom he forgave the most. And he said unto him: Thou hast rightly judged.

44. And turning to the woman, he said unto Simon: Seest thou this woman? I entered into thine house, thou gavest me no water for my feet: but she hath wetted my feet with her tears, and wiped them with her hair.

45. Thou gavest me no kiss; but she, since the time I came in, hath not ceased to kiss my feet.

46. My head with oil thou didst not anoint: but she hath anointed my feet with ointment.

47. Wherefore I say unto thee: Her sins, which are many, are forgiven; for she loved much: but to whom little is forgiven, the same loveth little.

48. And he said unto her: Thy sins are forgiven.

49. And they that sat at meat with him began to say within themselves: Who is this that even forgiveth sins?

42. Μὴ ἐχόντων αὐτῶν ἀποδοῦναι, ἀμφοτέροις ἐχαρίσατο: τίς οὖν αὐτῶν πλεῖον ἀγαπήσει αὐτόν;

43. Ἀποκριθεὶς Σίμων εἶπεν: Ὑπολαμβάνω, ὅτι ὃ τὸ πλεῖον ἐχαρίσατο. Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ: Ὁρθῶς ἔκρινας.

44. Καὶ στραφείς πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα, τῷ Σίμωνι ἔφη: Βλέπεις ταύτην τὴν γυναῖκα; εἰσῆλθόν σου εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν: ὕδωρ μοι ἐπὶ πόδας οὐκ ἔδωκας: αὕτη δὲ τοῖς δάκρυσιν ἔβρεξέν μου τοὺς πόδας, καὶ ταῖς θριξίν αὐτῆς ἐξέμαξεν.

45. Φιλημὰ μοι οὐκ ἔδωκας: αὕτη δὲ, ἀφ' ἧς εἰσῆλθον, οὐ διέλειπεν καταριλοῦσά μου τοὺς πόδας.

46. Ἐλαίῳ τὴν κεφαλὴν μου οὐκ ἠλείψας: αὕτη δὲ μύρῳ ἠλείψεν τοὺς πόδας μου.

47. Οὐ χάριν, λέγω σοι: Ἀφένονται αἱ ἁμαρτίαι αὐτῆς αἱ πολλαί, ὅτι ἡγάπησεν πολὺ: ὃ δὲ ὀλίγον ἀφίεται, ὀλίγον ἀγαπᾷ.

48. Εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῇ: Ἀφένονται σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι.

49. Καὶ ἤρξαντο οἱ συνανακείμενοι λέγειν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς: Τίς οὗτός ἐστιν, ὃς καὶ ἁμαρτίας ἀφήσιν;

50. And he said unto the woman: Thy faith hath saved thee; go in peace.

50. Εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα: ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε: πορεύου εἰς εἰρήνην.

In Verse thirty-nine, B and Z add the article *ὁ* before *προφήτης*. In Verse forty-second, many authorities add *εἶπε* before *πλεῖον*, but it is omitted in *Σ*, B, D, L, Z, and in the Vulgate, Syriac, Coptic, and Ethiopian versions.

In the forty-fourth verse *τῆς κεφαλῆς* is inserted after *θριξίν* in E, F, G, H, M, S, U, V, Γ, Δ, Λ, et al.

We have first to explain some critical data relating to the account, and then enter into the deep signification of the event itself.

Some have thought that the same event is described here which is found in Matthew XXVI. 6; in Mark XIV. 3; and in John XII. 1. This is especially the rationalistic view, and is defended by Schleiermacher, Ewald, Bleek, Holtzman, Schenkel, and Weizsaeker. They allege the similarity of the accounts and especially that in all accounts the man's name is Simon. The three elements therefore common in the accounts are the name of the host Simon, the feast, and the anointing.

We are firmly persuaded that Luke relates an entirely different event. The event related by the other three Evangelists took place in Bethany; while the present event is clearly a part of the Galilean ministry. The Simon mentioned by the other three writers is called the leper; while the Simon of Luke's account is called the Pharisee. The woman spoken of by Matthew, Mark and John anoints both the head and feet of Jesus; in Luke's accounts she anoints the feet of Jesus. John informs us that the woman in Bethany was Mary, the sister of Martha, and we are firmly convinced that the sister of Lazarus was never a public sinner. There are many other points of dissimilarity which will appear more clearly when we shall comment the passage in the three aforesaid Evangelists.

It was not an unusual thing for Jesus to enter the houses of the people, and sit at meat with them. It was a means of coming close to man, in order to teach him the great tidings of redemption and life. Hence he accepted the Pharisee's invitation, and came and sat at table with him.

The motive of the Pharisee in inviting Jesus seems not to have been to honor him. There is nothing in the whole account which betokens any honesty of heart in this Simon. Most probably his invitation was part of a concerted movement on the part of the Pharisees to entrap Jesus.

In accordance with the customs of the East, the Lord reclined on a couch while partaking of the banquet. His feet were either bare, or only covered with sandals which left the upper portion of the feet uncovered. In his reclining position, his feet also rested upon the couch.

A woman now enters, and approaches the couch of Jesus. She is a woman of evil life.

Some have held that this woman is called a sinner in a general sense, inasmuch as she was not zealous in the observance of the ritual law. Such opinion is untenable. The Holy Scriptures never specifically term a woman a sinner, unless she be infected with the peculiar sin of impurity.

This woman was known to Simon the host as a woman of ill fame. She holds a small cruse of perfumed ointment in her hand. This is called in the Gospel an alabaster cruse. The Oriental alabaster is composed chiefly of carbonate of lime, and is found in deposits of stalactites or stalagmites. Certain species of it are very beautiful, and these were employed to make statues, urns, vases, and especially vases for perfume. Pliny speaks of these: "Some call this stone alabastrites, and they make of it vases for perfume; because it is believed to preserve the perfume from all corruption."—Hist. Nat. XXXVI 12. But from the frequent use of this stone in the manufacture of vases and unguents, the word *ἀλάβαστρον* came to mean in general any small vessel for holding perfumes and unguents. Thus we have in English the word *alabastrum* signifying in general such vase. These alabastra might be of glass or other material. Hence it is not clear from the Gospel of what material the vase was wrought.

The modes and customs of the East made it possible for this woman to gain admission to the banquet without being invited thither. The account implies that the woman had been seeking an occasion to come to Jesus, and found it at last when she ascertained that he sat at meat with Simon the Pharisee.

She is humble. She approaches not the face of Jesus; but going back of his couch, she bows her head upon his feet, and bathes those sacred feet with copious tears of sorrow for her sins.

The clause in the thirty-eighth verse, "standing behind at his feet," does not mean that the woman stood erect while performing such actions. It only establishes the fact that she approached and stood at Jesus's feet, before she began the series of actions herein described.

An exceedingly touching feature of the event is the fact that the weeping woman wiped her tears from the feet of Jesus with the flowing tresses of her hair. It was an act of great tenderness, of intense love. Oh, the power of love! It is stronger than sin, death, and hell. Before its sublime power sin vanishes like the shades of night before the face of the sun. Conceive the rational creature, if possible, invested with every other attribute proper to its nature. But if love be wanting, it is a disappointment to its Creator.

After the first wild paroxysm of penitential grief had somewhat subsided, the woman kissed again and again Jesus' feet, and then anointed them with the perfumed unguent.

The Greek term *καταφιλέω* employed here means more than merely to kiss. The genius of the English tongue can not properly express it. *Κατά* is intensifying, and the compound means to kiss much, to kiss tenderly, to caress.

The woman gives evidence that she possesses humility, contrition, and love, and these three virtues never fail to move the Lord God. She is humble; for she does not deem herself worthy to stand in the presence of Jesus, but goes behind his couch, and bows her head at his feet. It would have been a fitting act to kiss his sacred hands; but she kisses his feet. Again, the unguent would have been proper to anoint Jesus' head; but she deems herself unworthy to do aught else than bow herself low at his feet, and weep for her sins, and testify by these subsequent acts her intense love. What a lesson for us who have sinned, and who do so much less to obtain the pardon of God? How her intense, earnest change of heart contrasts with our listless, perfunctory confessions, which move us not so much as our employments and our pleasures? Many have

sinned like the woman of the Gospel, but few have repented like her. As the world grows older, the hearts of men grow colder. Deep repentance presupposes strong faith, and that quality of mind is not easy to find. The proper persuasion of mind for a sinner is that the only aim and purpose in life for him is repentance; repentance that becomes a dominant force; repentance that lives, and acts, and shapes a life. Such repentance will redeem a life from the lowest depths of degradation; but it is rare. We find in the majority of cases in dealing with great sinners that their knowledge of the Christian religion is very elementary. A vague notion that there is a God, a Heaven and a hell; that there is an obligation to go to confession and Holy Communion; the shattered fragments of a few prayers clinging to the mind, —this is the religious equipment of many a man. And in such souls the call of Jesus produces no such effects as it did in the soul of this penitent woman. Her fineness of feeling, her absolute faith, and her great sorrow and love are all absent from such souls.

The Pharisee now shows the narrow mean spirit of his sect. He had witnessed the wonderful conduct of the woman. It would seem of a nature to move any heart. True, the woman was stained with foulest sin; but he had read Ezekiel; "Again, when I say unto the wicked: Thou shalt surely die, if he turn from his sin, and do that which is lawful and right; if the wicked restore the pledge, give again that he hath taken by robbery, walk in the statutes of life, committing no iniquity; he shall surely live, he shall not die. None of his sins that he hath committed shall be remembered against him."—XXXIII. 14-16. The woman had surely turned from her sin, with a broken, humble heart, and yet the Pharisee would not have her live. The Law said that he who touches an unclean thing is rendered unclean thereby. The sinful woman was an unclean thing, and the letter of the Law, as interpreted by the Pharisees, demanded that Jesus should repel the sinner from him. This was the cold official Pharisaical religion; a cold, dead formalism, holding out no hope to the crushed and bleeding heart, announcing no tidings of mercy to the fallen, awakening no sentiment of love in human hearts. The Law itself was imperfect,

and Pharisaic interpretation had perverted it until all the grand attributes of God were hidden behind the barrier of the mean, heartless creations of the Pharisaic body.

It was a prerogative of a prophet to know hidden things. His intellectual vision could pierce the future, could tell the issue when life and death strove for the mastery in the life of man. He was not omniscient; but was endowed with such extraordinary vision that he could rightly fulfill his mission as legate of the Most High. Therefore the Pharisee reasons within himself, that if Jesus were the legate of God, he would be able to divine the character of the woman who was clinging to his feet.

It is to be noted here that the only thought in Simon's mind is to determine whether or not his guest be a *prophet*. If we follow the reading of B and Z, we must read *the prophet*. It must be observed here that the Messiah himself is sometimes called a prophet in the Old Testament. A notable example is in Deuteronomy XVIII. 15. Hence the Jews waited for a great prophet who should be the Messiah, and should restore all things in Israel's polity. Wherefore, if we adopt the reading of these two codices, we must interpret that Simon had in mind the Messiah in his judgment of Jesus' action. If the reading of the other codices be accepted, then the reasoning of Simon would only regard the character of Jesus considered as a prophet in general.

The judgment of the Pharisee as regarded a prophet's power to know the character of one who came to him under such circumstances was true and logical; but he erred in his idea of what the Messiah should do to such a sinner recognized in her true character.

The Lord now gives evidence to Simon himself that he is a prophet; for he reads and lays bare before Simon the thought of Simon's soul before it has been uttered. Simon had uttered no word, but had only spoken within himself; and the Lord reads his thoughts, and answers their objection. The Lord Jesus made frequent use of his power as *καρδιογνώστης*. The manifestation of his power to know the hearts of men proved his Divinity, and at the same time impressed on the minds of the generations of men that all thoughts are laid bare and open to his gaze.

We come now to the most difficult part of the account, the parable of Jesus. The chief element of difficulty in the account is the application of the parable of the two debtors to illustrate the present case of the woman. In the case of the two debtors, the cause of the greater love of one of them was the fact that he had been forgiven a greater debt; whereas in the case of the woman her great love was the cause of the Lord's full forgiveness of her great debt of sin. It would not be profitable to review all the different opinions which have been proposed to explain this point. It has been a source of contention between Catholic theologians and the Calvinists, who try to deduce therefrom that the justification of man by grace pre-scinds from any act of preceding love or contrition, and that justification causes love in the manner that the forgiveness of the heavier debtor caused his subsequent act of love.

That all things may be made clear, we judge it best to begin by establishing what is clear in the verse, and then we shall attempt the explanation of the obscure elements, aided by the light of what is clear in the verse and by the analogy of faith.

The Lord, in the first place, heightens the grandeur of the woman's conduct by contrasting it act by act with the treatment that he had received at the hands of the Pharisee. Simon had invited Jesus to his table, but he had not exhibited to him any marks of special love. He had not offered him water to bathe his feet, which was a customary act of hospitality when a guest was come to one's house. We read that Abraham did thus for the celestial beings entertained by him by the oaks of Mamre, Gen. XVIII. 4; thus did Lot for these guests at their coming to his house at Sodom, Gen. XIX. 2; thus did Jesus also for his disciples before the Last Supper.

There is a beautiful antithesis here between the act of the Pharisee, and the act of the woman. The Pharisee had not felt moved to do the small service of providing water to bathe his guest's feet, but the woman had bathed them with tears of love and sorrow for sin.

The kiss of peace was also an office of hospitality to the guest. This had also been neglected by Simon; but the woman had repeatedly and with great tenderness kissed the feet of Simon's divine guest.

It was also a custom with Oriental peoples to anoint the heads of the guests with oil, as they sat at table. This custom is alluded to in Psalm twenty-second, fifth verse. This, of course, was not done for every guest, but was a mark of special honor to one whom the host might wish to honor. Here again the antithesis is especially strong. Simon had failed to testify his love, inasmuch as he did not anoint the *head* of Jesus with mere *oil*; but the woman anointed his *feet* with precious *ointment*.

The analysis and comparison of the conduct of the Pharisee and the woman are grand and beautiful. The woman is represented as having in large degree every quality ever asked by God in order to obtain forgiveness, and naught remained to be done except to declare her forgiven; and this the divine Lord did in words full of hope to every penitent sinner: "Thy sins are forgiven."

No man had ever employed such language before in Israel. There had been many great legates of God in Israel from Moses to John the Baptist, but none of them ever, in his own name, declared unto man that his sins were forgiven. That was an act like to creation itself, demanding the awful power of Yahveh himself.

The guests at Simon's table wondered that any man should declare an effect which only God can work. But they, at that time, failed to comprehend that Jesus spoke those words, and operated that effect, for the reason that he was the co-equal, co-eternal Son of God. The world has realized since that time how Jesus could speak thus, and no man who knows aught of the character of the Son of God, wonders now that Jesus should have uttered such a declaration.

The magnetic power of the personality of Jesus restrained the guests from giving utterance to their thoughts. They were filled with admiration, and wondered within themselves concerning the character of Jesus, but they were silent; and Jesus dismissed the woman with the comforting corroboration of his former declaration: "Thy faith hath made thee whole."

There is no contradiction here in the fact that Jesus here attributes to the causality of faith what he had formerly asserted to be the effect of love. Divine faith and divine love

are not two independent acts. Faith is the basis of every act of supernatural goodness in the soul. It is true, faith can exist without supernatural love, but such love can not exist without faith. Faith is the principle of supernatural life; and divine love is a vital act proceeding from a soul living by faith. Hence it is rightly said that the just man lives by faith. Now in the case of the woman, her faith was the cause of her love. By faith she perceived the real character of Jesus, and this moved her to love him, and to come to him, humbling herself in the sight of all, to ask mercy at his hands. The central truth of the whole account is the power of love to obtain forgiveness from God; and the Lord's approval of the woman's faith simply establishes the truth that faith and love are related as cause and effect. Both faith and love were combined in one moral cause, which obtained forgiveness from Jesus; and the Lord Jesus represents the two acts as identical in causality.

We can now state with certainty that the love of the woman, in the sense already explained, was the *cause* of her forgiveness. Calvin's horrid theory finds no endorsement here. The obscurity of the parable can not outweigh the clear declaration of Jesus: "Her sins which are many are forgiven; *for she loved much.*" This is not to say that sins are not forgiven except in virtue of a love like to that of this woman. This would render the way of salvation too difficult for poor weak man. There is an imperfect act of the mind of man called attrition. This is conceived in the mind by the consideration of the heinousness of sin and by consideration of the fear of hell and of other punishments. And if this act excludes the will to sin, and includes the hope of forgiveness, we hold that it will dispose the soul so that the grace of the sacrament of penance will justify the man thus contrite. This doctrine is based upon the teaching of the Council of Trent, Sess. XIV. 4, and is the common opinion of Catholic theologians. It is true, that the opinion is not a definition of faith, and there are some theologians who demand that there be in this attrition some act of love of God. The acts of the soul of man are so subtle that the analysis of them is extremely difficult. Certainly in many cases, when the soul turns away from sin, and turns to God, the leading motive is the fear of God's punishments

Luther declared that this act of man moving through the motive of fear, made a man a hypocrite, and more a sinner than before. The Council of Trent unequivocally condemned this opinion of the apostate, and declared that such act was a gift of the Holy Ghost, and that it disposed a man to obtain pardon of God in the sacrament of penance. At the same time, the Council did not define whether there was not required some act of love coupled with this useful act of fear. The issue is undecided by any decree of the Church, but the opinion asserting the sufficiency of the attrition which has for its motive fear, is an opinion which a man may hold and teach.

Of course, when Catholic teachers propound this doctrine it is not with a view to move the faithful to rely on the sufficiency of this act, and to make no effort to move their souls to any higher act. The aforesaid opinion is simply a scientific attempt to fix the minimum required by God, before he will take away the eternal punishment due to sin. It is an attempt to consider how far the mercy of God will condescend to supply for the weakness of man. Poor weak mortals are comforted and encouraged by knowing that the turning away from sin through fear is good. They can more readily proceed thence to some act of appreciative love of God; not that grand and perfect act of love which existed in the soul of the woman in the Gospel, but some lesser degree of the act of love which is the fulfilment of the law of God.

In fact, it seems that no man can turn away from sin because he fears the punishment of God, form the firm purpose not to sin in future, and hope for pardon of God, without conceiving in his soul some degree of the appreciative love of God. In the first place, he must have faith; "for he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that seek after him." Now, though the great motive in the sinner's change of soul may be fear of God's punishments, nevertheless, in the very act of turning away from sin, there will be a certain movement of the soul towards God, which we call an act of the appreciative love of God.

It is evident that the act of the woman and the testimony of Christ concerning it can not be used to support the opinion which demands an equal act of love of God as a necessary disposition of soul in order to obtain forgiveness.

In the first place, the woman was justified outside of the sacrament of penance, and all Catholics are agreed that outside of the sacrament of penance the act of perfect contrition would be required, which is an act of sorrow because one has lost the friendship of God. Perfect contrition is born of perfect love, and perfect love is the love of God above all things on account of his own infinite perfection. This justified the woman, and it justifies every creature that ever brings it into being in his soul, without the aid of the sacramental absolution; although now since the institution of the sacrament, the intention of receiving the sacrament must be included in the act of love.

But now another question arises out of the account. Is it necessary, in order to obtain justification outside of the sacrament of penance, to have the intensity of love of this woman, who by the Lord's own testimony *loved much*? This has been asserted by Peter Soto and other theologians. But we believe that the opposite opinion is to be held. We believe that the act of contrition, which proceeds from the love of God above all things for his own sake, justifies in the manner before explained, without demanding any special degree of intensity of this love. The best modern authority for our opinion is Palmieri, *De Pœnit.* Thesis XXIV.

In response to the difficulty sought from the present case of the woman, who was thus forgiven, *because she loved much*, it is evident that in the woman's case it was historically true that she was forgiven much, because she had loved much, but Christ's words do not mean that such degree was necessary to obtain the remission of sins. Such degree of intensity of love is necessary to obtain all that the woman obtained; but she received more than the mere remission of the eternal punishment due for her sins. She received a remission of the temporal punishment due for her sins commensurate to the perfection of her love; and this may have been a total remission of all. She received a large measure of God's grace; she rose high in the friendship of God; and all this is spoken of by Christ as the much that had been forgiven her, because she had loved much. From the mere taking away of the guilt of mortal sin out of the soul to the supreme limit of God's operations in the human soul God's actions range through many degrees; and the more

perfect the act of contrition, the more absolutely does it destroy sin and sin's consequences, and unite the soul to God. The woman's act was far more perfect than the minimum required to justify a sinner outside of the sacrament.

There is but one more element in the account which needs explanation, the application of the parable of the two debtors to the general theme of the passage. Now the context, the act of the woman, Christ's judgment thereon, and the effects that it obtained from Christ, give evidence that the Lord wished to teach by the whole event that love destroys sin, and establishes in the soul the friendship of God. The parable of the two debtors is a general introduction to the main teaching. The parable is not to be taken in an absolute sense, but in a moral sense. If the debtor who was forgiven the heavier debt were base and ungrateful, he would love his benefactor less than the other. But the Lord conceives the issue in the sense of what ought to happen, morally speaking, among men in such a case.

It cannot be that the Lord wished to teach by the parable that in his dealings with men it is usually verified that those who are forgiven the greater debt love God more than those who have never offended God so deeply, and who have therefore a smaller debt to be forgiven. Usually the love of God grows in the soul by the purifying, refining influence of virtue, while sin coarsens the soul, blunts its finer powers, and makes it more difficult for it to apprehend and to love God. The more holy the soul becomes, the more does the horror of sin increase; and the love of God grows in the same ratio.

Wherefore we believe that the Lord wished to illustrate by the two insolvent debtors a specific phenomenon that occurs in the life of humanity. The debtor who owed five hundred pence, and who was forgiven, represents the class of great sinners who are really repentant. King David belonged to this class, the woman in the present passage belonged to it, the penitent thief belonged to it. The hearts of these are pierced through with blessed repentance, and the gratitude that they feel in return for God's merciful pardon generates in their hearts a strong tender love of God. The great sinners who experience this soul-change in all its perfection are few, but there are

some. These love God very much, because the continual remembrance of his gracious mercy in forgiving their heavy offenses keeps love alive in their souls.

It is an aphorism that "*omnis comparatio claudicat.*" Even among the similes of our Lord some are more forcible than others. The general application of the present simile will be made clearer by a consideration of its specific application to Simon the Pharisee and to the sinful woman. They were two debtors unto God. Though it is not declared just how they stood in the sight of God, certainly Simon believed himself more righteous than the sinful woman. In the parable Jesus allows the supposition to stand that Simon is less sinful. And now the great point of the parable comes in. The Lord does more for the greater sinner than for the one who is assumed to have sinned less. The Lord was not asked by Simon to forgive his sins, and therefore did not bestow on him the great benefit given the woman. The fact that Simon had received *less* than the woman is illustrated by likening Simon to the debtor to whom a creditor forgave fifty pence. As the Pharisee and the woman stood there before the Lord, the woman loved the Lord more. Her love was the cause of her forgiveness, and it was also the effect of her forgiveness. Surely she who had loved much before her forgiveness, loved more after the merciful Lord had added another great motive of love. The Lord points to her grateful love and compares it to the Pharisee's lesser love. The Lord then clearly tells why he forgave more to the woman. He forgave her because she loved much. The main truth is this: that love destroys sin and brings a sinner into a better relation with God than is that of the man who may have sinned less, but who fails in love. This is not to diminish the horror or lessen the realization of sin's evil nature. In general those who love God most sin least. Sin injures the spiritual powers of a man's nature; it coarsens the soul, and blunts spiritual perception. Sin is an essential evil, the only absolute evil in the universe. Every man should condemn that false theory that lessens the realization of the evil of sin by a maudlin sentimentality.

The present teaching is a message of hope to the sinner, declaring what may be accomplished by penitential love. It is

a condemnation of hypocrisy and self-righteousness, which prevent a man from seeing himself as God sees him. It is a terrible message to those cold hearted mortals, who may live worldly, respectable lives, but who have little or no love of God in their hearts. Weighed in the balance with these the poor outcast honestly returning to God through repentance and love is more acceptable to God. A loving father desires that his children be virtuous, and that they love him; but his heart would be more comforted by the sincere return of a prodigal who loved him, than by the officially correct conduct of a cold, unfeeling, thankless child. So God's creature can offer him nothing better than love, nothing that will take the place of love. No created mind can comprehend God's love for his creature, and this love demands love in return.

There is a grand lesson in the passage for every man. It should serve to arouse cold worldly-wise people whose lives are fairly respectable, but whose hearts are void of love, to what an extent their lives are a disappointment to God.

The passage contains a grand message of hope to the repenting sinner. It shows him the grand things that are yet possible to him by means of repentance and love. It exhibits a grand true type of repentance to all men, and convinces us how poor often our own repentance is. It portrays the Lord Jesus in his grand characteristics of truth and mercy, and it represents the love of God in its true value.

MATT. XIII. 1—23.

1. Ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἐξεληθὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῆς οἰκίας ἐκάθητο παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν.

2. Καὶ συνήχθησαν πρὸς αὐτὸν ὄχλοι πολλοί, ὥστε αὐτὸν εἰς πλοῖον ἐμβάντα καθῆσθαι καὶ πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος ἐπὶ τὸν αἰγιαλὸν εἰστῆκει.

3. Καὶ ἐλάλησεν αὐτοῖς πολλὰ ἐν παραβολαῖς λέγων: Ἴδου ἐξηληθεν ὁ σπείρων τοῦ σπείραι.

MARK IV. 1—25.

1. Καὶ πάλιν ἤρξατο διδάσκειν παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν: καὶ συνάγεται πρὸς αὐτὸν ὄχλος πλείστος, ὥστε αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ πλοῖον ἐμβάντα καθῆσθαι ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ: καὶ πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος πρὸς τὴν θάλασσαν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἦσαν.

2. Καὶ ἐδίδασκεν αὐτοὺς ἐν παραβολαῖς πολλὰ, καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς ἐν τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ.

3. Ἀκούετε: ἰδοὺ, ἐξηληθεν ὁ σπείρων σπείραι.

4. Καὶ ἐν τῷ σπεῖρειν αὐτὸν ἃ μὲν ἔπесен παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν, καὶ ἐλθόντα τὰ πετεινὰ κατέφαγεν αὐτά.

5. Ἄλλα δὲ ἔπесен ἐπὶ τὰ πετρῶδη ὅπου οὐκ εἶχεν γῆν πολλήν, καὶ εὐθέως ἐξανέτειλαν διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν βάθος τῆς γῆς.

6. Ἑλίου δὲ ἀνατελιαντος ἐκαυματώθη, καὶ διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν ρίζαν ἐξηράνθη.

7. Ἄλλα δὲ ἔπесен ἐπὶ τὰς ἀάνθας, καὶ ἀνέδησαν αἱ ἄκανθαι, καὶ ἀπέπνιξαν αὐτά.

8. Ἄλλα δὲ ἔπесен ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν τὴν καλήν, καὶ ἐδίδου καρπὸν, ὃ μὲν ἑκατόν, ὃ δὲ ἐξήκοντα, ὃ δὲ τριάκοντα.

9. Ὁ ἔχων ὦτα, ἀκουέτω.

10. Καὶ προσελθόντες οἱ μαθηταὶ εἶπαν αὐτῷ: Διὰ τί ἐν παραβολαῖς λαλεῖς αὐτοῖς;

11. Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς: Ὅτι ὑμῖν δέδοται γινῶναι τὰ μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν, ἐκεῖνοις δὲ οὐ δέδοται.

12. Ὅστις γὰρ ἔχει, δοθήσεται αὐτῷ, καὶ περισσευθήσεται: ὅστις δὲ οὐκ ἔχει, καὶ ὃ ἔχει ἀρθήσεται ἀπ' αὐτοῦ.

13. Διὰ τοῦτο ἐν παραβολαῖς αὐτοῖς λαλῶ, ὅτι βλέποντες οὐ βλέπουσιν, καὶ ἀκούοντες οὐκ ἀκούουσιν, οὐδὲ συνίουσιν.

14. Καὶ ἀναπληροῦται αὐτοῖς ἡ προφητεία Ἡσαΐου, ἡ λέγουσα: Ἀκοῇ ἀκούσετε, καὶ οὐ μὴ συνῆτε:

4. Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ σπεῖρειν, ὃ μὲν ἔπесен παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν, καὶ ἦλθεν τὰ πετεινὰ, καὶ κατέφαγεν αὐτό.

5. Καὶ ἄλλο ἔπесен ἐπὶ τὸ πετρῶδες, καὶ ὅπου οὐκ εἶχεν γῆν πολλήν, καὶ εὐθύς ἐξανέτειλεν, διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν βάθος τῆς γῆς.

6. Καὶ ὅτε ἀνέτειλεν ὁ ἥλιος ἐκαυματίσθησαν, καὶ διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν ρίζαν, ἐξηράνθη.

7. Καὶ ἄλλο ἔπесен εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας, καὶ ἀνέδησαν αἱ ἄκανθαι, καὶ συνεπνίξαν αὐτὸ καὶ καρπὸν οὐκ ἔδωκεν.

8. Καὶ ἄλλα ἔπесен εἰς τὴν γῆν τὴν καλήν, καὶ ἐδίδου καρπὸν ἀναβαίνοντα καὶ αὐξανόμενα, καὶ ἔφερεν εἰς τριάκοντα, καὶ ἐν ἐξήκοντα, καὶ ἐν ἑκατόν.

9. Καὶ ἔλεγεν: Ὅς ἔχει ὦτα ἀκούειν, ἀκουέτω.

10. Καὶ ὅτε ἐγένετο κατὰ μόνας, ἡρώτων αὐτὸν οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν σὺν τοῖς δώδεκα, τὰς παραβολὰς.

11. Καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς: Ὑμῖν τὸ μυστήριον δέδοται τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐκεῖνοις δὲ τοῖς ἔξωθεν ἐν παραβολαῖς τὰ πάντα γίνεται.

12. Ἵνα βλέποντες βλέπωσι, καὶ μὴ ἴδωσιν, καὶ ἀκούοντες ἀκούωσι, καὶ μὴ συνιώσιν, μήποτε ἐπιστρέψωσιν, καὶ ἀφῇ αὐτοῖς.

13. Καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς: Οὐκ οἴδατε τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην; καὶ πῶς πάσας τὰς παραβολὰς γινώσσετε.

καὶ βλέποντες βλέψετε, καὶ οὐ μὴ ἴδῃτε.

15. Ἐπαχύνθη γὰρ ἡ καρδία τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου, καὶ τοῖς ὠσὶν βαρέως ἤκουσαν, καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν ἐκάμμυσαν, μήποτε ἴδωσιν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς, καὶ τοῖς ὠσὶν ἀκούσωσιν, καὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ συνώσιν, καὶ ἐπιστρέψωσιν, καὶ ἰάσονται αὐτούς.

16. Ὑμῶν δὲ μακάριοι οἱ ὀφθαλμοί, ὅτι βλέπουσιν, καὶ τὰ ὥτα, ὅτι ἀκούουσιν.

17. Ἀμὴν γὰρ λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι πολλοὶ προφῆται καὶ δίκαιοι ἐπέθυμῃσαν ἰδεῖν ἃ βλέπετε, καὶ οὐκ ἴδαν, καὶ ἀκοῦσαι ἃ ἀκούετε, καὶ οὐκ ἤκουσαν.

18. Ὑμεῖς οὖν ἀκούσατε τὴν παραβολὴν τοῦ σπειράντος.

19. Παντὸς ἀκούοντος τὸν λόγον τῆς βασιλείας, καὶ μὴ συνιέντος, ἔρχεται ὁ πονηρὸς, καὶ ἄρπάζει τὸ ἐσπαρμένον ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν σπαρεῖς.

20. Ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ τὰ πετρώδη σπαρεῖς, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τὸν λόγον ἀκούων, καὶ εὐθὺς μετὰ χαρᾶς λαμβάνων αὐτόν:

21. Οὐκ ἔχει δὲ ρίζαν ἐν ἑαυτῷ, ἀλλὰ πρόσκαιρός ἐστιν, γενομένης δὲ θλίψεως ἢ διωγμοῦ διὰ τὸν λόγον, εὐθὺς σκανδαλίζεται.

22. Ὁ δὲ εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας σπαρεῖς, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τὸν λόγον ἀκούων, καὶ ἡ μέριμνα τοῦ αἰῶνος, καὶ ἡ ἀπάτη τοῦ πλοῦτου συμπνίγει τὸν λόγον, καὶ ἄκαρπος γίνεται.

14. Ὁ σπείρων τὸν λόγον σπείρει.

15. Οὗτοι δὲ εἰσιν οἱ παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν, ὅπου σπείρεται ὁ λόγος, οἳ ὅταν ἀκούσωσιν, εὐθὺς ἔρχεται ὁ Σατανᾶς, καὶ αἶρει τὸν λόγον τὸν ἐσπαρμένον εἰς αὐτούς.

16. Καὶ οὗτοι εἰσιν ὁμοίως οἱ ἐπὶ τὰ πετρώδη σπειρόμενοι, οἳ ὅταν ἀκούσωσι τὸν λόγον, εὐθὺς μετὰ χαρᾶς λαμβάνουσιν αὐτόν.

17. Καὶ οὐκ ἔχουσιν ρίζαν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, ἀλλὰ πρόσκαιροί εἰσιν, εἴτα γενομένης θλίψεως ἢ διωγμοῦ διὰ τὸν λόγον, εὐθὺς σκανδαλίζονται.

18. Καὶ ἄλλοι εἰσιν οἱ εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας σπειρόμενοι, οὗτοι εἰσιν οἱ τὸν λόγον ἀκούσαντες,

19. Καὶ αἱ μέριμναι τοῦ αἰῶνος, καὶ ἡ ἀπάτη τοῦ πλοῦτου, καὶ αἱ περὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἐπιθυμίαι εἰσπορευόμεναι συμπνίγουσιν τὸν λόγον, καὶ ἄκαρπος γίνεται.

23. Ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν καλὴν γῆν σπαρείς, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τὸν λόγον ἀκούων καὶ συνιείς, ὃς δὴ καρποφορεῖ, καὶ ποιεῖ, ὃ μὲν ἑκατόν, ὃ δὲ ἐξήκοντα ὃ δὲ τριάκοντα.

20. Καὶ ἐκεῖνοί εἰσιν οἱ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν τὴν καλὴν σπαρέντες, οἵτινες ἀκούουσιν τὸν λόγον, καὶ παραδέχονται, καὶ καρποφοροῦσιν ἐν τριάκοντα, καὲ ἐξήκοντα καὲ ἑκατόν.

21. Καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς: Ὅτι μῆτι ἔρχεται ὁ λύχνος, ἵνα ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον τεθῇ ἢ ὑπὸ τὴν κλίνην; οὐχ ἵνα ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν τεθῇ;

22. Οὐ γάρ ἐστιν κρυπτόν, ἐὰν μὴ ἵνα φανερωθῇ: οὐδὲ ἐγένετο ἀπόκρυφον, ἀλλ' ἵνα φανερωθῇ.

23. Εἴ τις ἔχει ὠτα ἀκούειν, ἀκουέτω.

24. Καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς: Βλέπετε τί ἀκούετε: ἐν ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε, μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν καὶ προστεθήσεται ὑμῖν.

25. Ὃς γὰρ ἔχει, δοθήσεται αὐτῷ, καὲ ὃς οὐκ ἔχει, καὲ ὃ ἔχει ἀρθήσεται ἀπ' αὐτοῦ.

1. On that day Jesus went out of the house, and sat by the sea side.

2. And there were gathered unto him great multitudes, so that he entered into a boat, and sat; and all the multitude stood on the beach.

3. And he spake to them many things in parables, saying: Behold, the sower went forth to sow:

4. And as he sowed, some seeds fell by the way side, and the birds came and devoured them:

1. And again he began to teach by the sea side. And there is gathered unto him a very great multitude, so that he entered into a boat, and sat in the sea; and all the multitude were by the sea on the land.

2. And he taught them many things in parables, and said unto them in his teaching:

3. Hearken: Behold the sower went forth to sow:

4. And it came to pass, as he sowed, some seed fell by the way side, and the birds came and devoured it.

5. And others fell upon the rocky places, where they had not much earth: and straightway they sprang up, because they had no deepness of earth:

6. And when the sun was risen, they were scorched; and because they had no root, they withered away.

7. And others fell upon the thorns; and the thorns grew up, and choked them:

8. And others fell upon the good ground, and yielded fruit, some a hundredfold, some sixty, some thirty.

9. He that hath ears, let him hear.

10. And the disciples came, and said unto him: Why speakest thou unto them in parables?

11. And he answered and said unto them: Unto you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of Heaven, but to them it is not given.

12. For whosoever hath, to him shall be given, and he shall have abundance: but whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken away even that which he hath.

13. Therefore I speak to them in parables; because see-

5. And other fell on the rocky ground, where it had not much earth; and straightway it sprang up, because it had no deepness of earth:

6. And when the sun was risen, it was scorched; and because it had no root, it withered away.

7. And other fell among the thorns, and the thorns grew up, and choked it; and it yielded no fruit.

8. And others fell into the good ground, and yielded fruit growing up and increasing and brought forth, thirtyfold, and sixtyfold, and a hundredfold.

9. And he said: Who hath ears to hear, let him hear.

10. And when he was alone, they that were about him with the twelve asked of him the parables.

11. And he said unto them: Unto you is given the mystery of the kingdom of God: but unto them that are without, all things are done in parables:

12. That seeing they may see, and not perceive; and hearing they may hear, and not understand; lest haply they should turn again, and it should be forgiven them.

13. And he saith unto them: Know ye not this par-

ing they see not, and hearing they hear not, neither do they understand. able? and how shall ye know all the parables?

14. And unto them is fulfilled the prophecy of Isaiah, which saith: By hearing ye shall hear, and shall in no wise understand; and seeing ye shall in no wise perceive:

15. For this people's heart is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have closed; lest haply they should perceive with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and should turn again, and I should heal them.

16. But blessed are your eyes, for they see; and your ears, for they hear.

17. For verily I say unto you, that many prophets and righteous men desired to see the things which ye see, and saw them not; and to hear the things which ye hear, and heard them not.

18. Hear then ye the parable of the sower.

19. When any one heareth the word of the kingdom, and understandeth it not, then cometh the evil one, and snatcheth away that which hath been sown in his heart. This is he that was sown by the way side.

20. And he that was sown upon the rocky places, this is

14. The sower soweth the word.

15. And these are they by the way side, where the word is sown; and when they have heard, straightway cometh Satan, and taketh away the word which hath been sown in them.

16. And these in like manner are they that are sown

he that heareth the word, and straightway with joy receiveth it;

21. Yet he hath not root in himself, but endureth for a while; and when tribulation or persecution ariseth because of the word, straightway he stumbleth.

22. And he that was sown among the thorns, this is he that heareth the word; and the care of the world, and the deceitfulness of riches, choke the word, and he becometh unfruitful.

23. And he that was sown upon the good ground, this is he that heareth the word, and understandeth it; who verily beareth fruit, and bringeth forth, some a hundredfold, some sixty, some thirty.

upon the rocky places, who, when they have heard the word, straightway receive it with joy;

17. And they have no root in themselves, but endure for a while; then, when tribulation or persecution ariseth because of the word, straightway they stumble.

18. And others are they that are sown among the thorns; these are they that have heard the word.

19. And the cares of the world, and the deceitfulness of riches, and the lusts of other things entering in, choke the word, and it becometh unfruitful.

20. And those are they that were sown upon the good ground; such as hear the word, and accept it, and bear fruit, thirtyfold, and sixtyfold, and a hundredfold.

21. And he said unto them: Is the lamp brought to be put under the bushel, or under the bed, and not to be put on the stand?

22. For there is nothing hid, save that it should be manifested; neither was anything made secret, but that it should come to light.

23. If any man hath ears to hear, let him hear.

24. And he said unto them: Take heed what ye hear: with what measure ye measure, it shall be measured unto you: and more shall be given unto you.

25. For he that hath, to him shall be given: and he that hath not, from him shall be taken away even that which he hath.

LUKE VIII. 1—18.

1. And it came to pass soon afterwards, that he went about through cities and villages, preaching and bringing the good tidings of the kingdom of God, and with him the twelve,

2. And certain women who had been healed of evil spirits and infirmities, Mary that was called Magdalene, from whom seven devils had gone out,

3. And Joanna the wife of Chuza, Herod's steward, and Susanna, and many others, who ministered unto them of their substance.

4. And when a great multitude came together, and they of every city resorted unto him, he spoke by a parable:

5. The sower went forth to sow his seed: and as he sowed, some fell by the way side; and

1, Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ καθεξῆς, καὶ αὐτὸς διώδευεν κατὰ πόλιν καὶ κώμην, κηρύσσων καὶ εὐαγγελιζόμενος, τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ οἱ δώδεκα σὺν αὐτῷ.

2. Καὶ γυναῖκες τινες, αἱ ἦσαν τεθεραπευμέναι ἀπὸ πνευμάτων πονηρῶν καὶ ἀσθενειῶν, Μαρία, ἡ καλουμένη Μαγδαληνή, ἀφ' ἧς δαιμόνια ἑπτὰ ἐξεληλύθει.

3. Καὶ Ἰωάννα, γυνὴ Χουζᾶ, ἐπιτρόπου Ἡρώδου, καὶ Σουσάννα, καὶ ἕτεραι πολλαί, αἵτινες διηκόνουν αὐτοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐταῖς.

4. Συνιόντος δὲ ὄχλου πολλοῦ, καὶ τῶν κατὰ πόλιν ἐπιπορευομένων πρὸς αὐτόν, εἶπεν διὰ παραβολῆς.

5. Ἐξῆλθεν ὁ σπείρων τοῦ σπει-
ραι τὸν σπόρον αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐν τῷ
σπείρειν αὐτόν, ἃ μὲν ἔπεσεν παρὰ

it was trodden under foot, and the birds of the heaven devoured it.

6. And other fell on the rock; and as soon as it grew, it withered away, because it had no moisture.

7. And other fell amidst the thorns; and the thorns grew with it, and choked it.

8. And other fell into the good ground, and grew, and brought forth fruit a hundred-fold. As he said these things, he cried: He that hath ears to hear, let him hear.

9. And his disciples asked him what this parable might be.

10. And he said: Unto you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of God: but to the rest in parables; that seeing they may not see, and hearing they may not understand.

11. Now the parable is this: The seed is the word of God.

12. And those by the way side are they that have heard; then cometh the devil, and taketh away the word from their heart, that they may not believe and be saved.

13. And those on the rock are they which, when they have heard, receive the word with joy; and these have no root, who for a while believe, and in time of temptation fall away.

τὴν ὁδόν, καὶ κατεπατήθη, καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατέφαγεν αὐτά.

6. Καὶ ἕτερον κατέπεσεν ἐπὶ πέτραν, καὶ φυὲν ἐξηράνθη, διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν ἰκμάδα.

7. Καὶ ἕτερον ἔπεσεν ἐν μέσῳ τῶν ἀκανθῶν, καὶ συμφυεῖσαι αὐτῇ ἀκανθαὶ ἀπέπνιξαν αὐτό.

8. Καὶ ἕτερον ἔπεσεν εἰς τὴν γῆν τὴν ἀγαθὴν, καὶ φυὲν ἐποίησεν καρπὸν ἑκατονταπλασίονα. Ταῦτα λέγων, ἐφώνει: Ὁ ἔχων ὦτα ἀκούειν, ἀκούετω.

9. Ἐπρώτων δὲ αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ: Τίς αὕτη εἴη παραβολή.

10. Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν: Ὑμῖν δέδοται γινῶναι τὰ μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ, τοῖς δὲ λοιποῖς ἐν παραβολαῖς, ἵνα βλέποντες μὴ βλέπωσιν, καὶ ἀκούοντες μὴ συνιῶσιν.

11. Ἔστιν δὲ αὕτη ἡ παραβολή: Ὁ σπόρος ἐστὶν ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ.

12. Οἱ δὲ παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν εἰσὶν οἱ ἀκούσαντες, εἴτα ἔρχεται ὁ διάβολος, καὶ αἶρει τὸν λόγον ἀπὸ τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν, ἵνα μὴ πιστεύσαντες σωθῶσιν.

13. Οἱ δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς πέτρας, οἳ ὅταν ἀκούσωσιν, μετὰ χαρᾶς δέχονται τὸν λόγον, καὶ οὗτοι ρίξαν οὐκ ἔχουσιν, οἳ πρὸς καιρὸν πιστεύουσιν καὶ ἐν καιρῷ πειρασμοῦ ἀφίστανται.

14. And that which fell among the thorns, these are they that have heard, and as they go on their way they are choked with cares and riches and pleasures of this life, and bring no fruit to perfection.

15. And that in the good ground, these are such as in an honest and good heart, having heard the word, hold it fast, and bring forth fruit with patience.

16. And no man, when he hath lighted a lamp, covereth it with a vessel, or putteth it under a bed; but putteth it on a stand, that they who enter in may see the light.

17. For nothing is hid, that shall not be made manifest; nor anything secret, that shall not be known and come to light.

18. Take heed therefore how ye hear: for whosoever hath, to him shall be given; and whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken away even that which he thinketh he hath.

14. Τὸ δὲ εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας πεσόν, οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἀκούσαντες, καὶ ὑπὸ μεριμνῶν καὶ πλούτου καὶ ἡδονῶν τοῦ βίου πορευόμενοι συμπνίγονται, καὶ οὐ τελεσφοροῦσιν.

15. Τὸ δὲ ἐν τῇ καλῇ γῇ, οὗτοί εἰσιν οἵτινες ἐν καρδίᾳ καλῇ καὶ ἀγαθῇ ἀκούσαντες τὸν λόγον κατέχουσιν, καὶ καρποφοροῦσιν ἐν ὑπομονῇ.

16. Οὐδεὶς δὲ λύχνον ἄψας, καλύπτει αὐτὸν σκεύει, ἢ ὑποκάτω κλίνης τίθουσιν, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ λυχνίας τίθουσιν.

17. Οὐ γάρ ἐστιν κρυπτόν, ὃ οὐ φανερόν γενήσεται, οὐδὲ ἀπόκρυφον, ὃ οὐ μὴ γνωσθῇ καὶ εἰς φανερόν ἔλθῃ.

18. Βλέπετε οὖν πῶς ἀκούετε: ὃς ἂν γὰρ ἔχῃ, δοθήσεται αὐτῷ, καὶ ὃς ἂν μὴ ἔχῃ, καὶ ὃ δοκεῖ ἔχειν ἀρθήσεται ἀπ' αὐτοῦ.

In all the Greek codices except B, we find the preposition *ἐκ* or *ἀπό* before *τῆς οἰκίας* in the first verse of Matthew. In the second verse of the same, we find the article *τό* before *πλοῖον* in many codices, but it is omitted by **Σ**, B, C, L, and Z.

In Verse four, B is the only uncial codex that has *ἐλθόντα*, the others have *ἦλθον*. In this same verse E*, K, M, Π, et al. add *οὐρανοῦ*, which is followed by the Vulgate, the Syriac of Cureton, the Armenian and the Ethiopian versions.

In the sixth verse Tischendorf, Westcott, and Hort read *ἐκαυματίσθη* instead of *ἐκαυματώθη*.

Many authorities add *ἀκούειν* in the ninth verse, but it is omitted by \aleph , B, L, Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort.

In the fourteenth verse E, F, G, M, U, V, Γ , et al. have *ἀκούσητε* and *βλέψητε*.

In the eighteenth verse, B has *σπείραντος*, but most of the codices have *σπείροντος*. In Verse twenty-two the greater number of codices add *τούτου* after *αἰῶνος*. In Verse twenty-three \aleph , B, and D, have *συνιείς*: the other codices have *συνιών*.

In the fourth verse of Mark, D, G, and M add *τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*. In Verse six \aleph and D have *τὰ πετρώδη*. In Verse eleven, *γινῶναι* is omitted in \aleph , B, C*, L, A, K, Π , et al. At the end of Verse twelve, *τὰ ἁμαρτήματα* is added in A, D, Δ , Π , et al. Such reading is followed by the Vulgate, Syriac and Coptic versions. In the twentieth verse, Tischendorf approves *ἐν* before *τριάκοντα*, *ἑξήκοντα*, and *ἐκατόν* on the authority of E, F, G, H, K, M, U, V, and Π . Other authorities read *εἰς*, and others read *ἐν*. In the twenty-second verse *τί* is inserted before *κρυπτόν* in \aleph , A, C, E, F, G, L, S, V, and Δ . It is omitted in B, D, H, K, M, U, et al. In the same verse, we find *ἐὰν μὴ ἴνα* in \aleph , B, and Δ . In others the reading *ὃ ἐὰν μὴ* exists. At the end of this verse many codices have *εἰς φανερόν ἔλθῃ* where B has *φανερωθῇ*.

In the third verse of St. Luke, the great majority of the codices have the plural *αὐτοῖς* after *διηκόνουν*. \aleph , A, L, M, X, and Π have *αὐτῷ*.

The years of our Lord's public life were an active career of preaching. He did not wait for the people to come to him, but went out through the cities and villages, that is to say, wherever the people were to be found; and he taught them the great doctrine of the New Testament, and confirmed his teaching by miracles. At this time the twelve Apostles accompanied him, and they trusted the providence of God to provide for them the necessaries of life.

Maintenance was at this time provided by certain pious women who went with the company of our Lord and his Apostles throughout Galilee. By this tenor of life the Lord gives evidence that "though he was rich, yet for our sakes he

became poor, that we through his poverty might become rich." —II. Cor. VIII. 9. He also spared the poor people of the small villages the expense of entertaining him and his followers, and gave to these good women an occasion to practise a great act of charity. The custom of allowing women to minister to their needs was afterwards employed by many of the Apostles, although Paul dispensed with such service.—I. Cor. IX. 5.

St. Luke mentions three of these pious women, Mary Magdalene, Joanna the wife of Chuza, and Susanna. Of Susanna we know nothing more than this bare mention. Joanna the wife of Chuza is mentioned again by St. Luke, XXIV. 10, as being one of the women who followed Jesus out of Galilee, and who was one of the witnesses of the Resurrection. It has been conjectured by Schegg and Godet that Chuza was the officer of Herod Antipas, whose son Jesus healed at Capharnaum. Nothing certain is known. It is evident that she was a woman of high social station, and she was pleased to devote a part of her means to provide for Jesus and his Apostles during their career of preaching.

Much more interest centers in the first woman mentioned by Luke, Mary that was called Magdalene.

The surname Magdalene given to this woman undoubtedly comes from her residence in Magdala, a small hamlet on the western shore of the Lake of Gennesaret. The ruins of the small village are now called El-Medjdel. See *A Diary of My Life in the Holy Land*.

In the Latin Church, Mary Magdalene is identified with the woman who had been a sinner, and who anointed our Lord's feet as he sat at meat in the house of Simon the Pharisee. The same traditional opinion makes her also the sister of Martha and Lazarus of Bethany. The Roman Breviary assigns the Gospel of Luke concerning the event in the house of Simon the Pharisee, to be read on the feast of Mary Magdalene, and Augustine's homily thereon endorses fully that persuasion. On the feast of Martha, we read that Martha, Mary, Lazarus, and many other Christians were seized by the Jews, and placed in a ship without sails or oars, and committed to the mercy of the waves of the Mediterranean. By a miracle of divine power, they came safely to Marseilles, and Lazarus became bishop

of that city. The account declares that Mary withdrew into the desert where she lived a holy life of contemplation for more than thirty years. Marseilles claims to have her relics. This account is approved by the Roman Martyrology, and by John Sollerius in the *Acta Sanctorum* (Ad diem 22 Julii).

Now in order that we may enter with proper dispositions of mind into the discussion of this question, we must first premise that the question in nowise pertains to any matter of faith or morals. It is a mere matter of biographical history. The Breviary and Martyrology in these matters of history are not infallible, and should be subjected to the same critical tests as other historical records. The prayers of the Breviary and Missal in honor of saints are based upon the historical accounts of the two books, and add nothing to the authority of such accounts. Hence the consensus of Fathers and doctors in the Church, if such were verified, in such questions as these avails only what their documents and proofs are worth.

The great consensus of opinion, in the Western Church is to make Mary Magdalene the converted sinner, and identify her with the sister of Lazarus. But such unanimity by no means exists in the Greek Church. The learned Bollandist Sollerius is forced to admit that many Greek writers deny the Western tradition, and they assert that after the death of Jesus, Mary Magdalene came to Ephesus and lived with St. John. In questions of Holy Scripture there is no Father in the Universal Church of Christ that is possessed of the critical acumen and sound judgment of Chrysostom, and he declares in his eighty-first homily on Matthew that the sister of Lazarus is distinct from the sinner who anointed the feet of Jesus in the house of Simon the Pharisee.

The best opinion in all tradition seems to be that of Theophylactus: "Many inquire how many women anointed our Lord with ointment. Some say there were two; one who is mentioned by John, who was the sister of Lazarus, and another mentioned by Matthew, Mark, and Luke. I believe with those who assert that there were three: one who was the sister of Lazarus, and who is mentioned by St. John; another who anointed our Lord two days before the Pasch, mentioned by Matthew and Mark; and this third one, whose anointing of

Jesus is mentioned by Luke."—*Acta Sanct. V. Julii*. This was also the opinion of Origen, and it is the common opinion of the Greek menologies.

We have cited these authorities to show that there is no real consensus of Catholic tradition on the subject, and that the field is open for critical research.

We shall not at this time finish the question of Mary Magdalene. Later on, when dealing with the events of Jesus' life at Bethany, we shall examine the question whether or not the Magdalene be the sister of Lazarus and Martha; but in the treatment of the present text, we have in mind to prove two things:

1. We believe that Mary Magdalene is not the woman mentioned in Luke, VII. 37.

2. We believe that there is no valid evidence in the Scriptures that Mary Magdalene was a woman of sin, before her conversion to the Lord.

The second proposition is new and strange; but a close, conscientious examination of the data of the Scriptures persuades us that the popular idea of this woman is erroneous.

The defense of the first proposition is easier. We have seen that our opinion in this proposition is held by Theophylactus and Origen; and, in fact, that it is the common opinion in the Greek Church. A valid argument in support of it can be drawn from the text of Luke itself. Luke wrote in the days when Magdalene was famous on account of the events connected with Calvary and the Holy Sepulchre. Now it seems incredible that Luke should omit to mention the name of the chief actor in the great event in the house of the Pharisee, if she had been Mary Magdalene. Certain it is that a woman, who had been so closely associated with the Blessed Virgin Mary and St. John at the foot of the cross, and who had been so highly favored by the risen Lord, would be personally known to the accurate historian Luke, who of all the Evangelists is most careful to mention every historical fact and detail that will make the account fuller and more credible. Such a man would not pass over in silence the identity of the actor in such an important event, had it been a woman who plays such an important part as that of Magdalene in the New Testament.

And when we turn to examine the proofs of our opponents, not a shred of any proof exists, except a mass of the sayings of men, who repeat what others have said before them without any critical examination thereof.

But the first proposition which we have above laid down will be corroborated by our defense of the second.

We confess a certain feeling of timidity and sadness in setting out to overthrow an opinion which we learned in our childhood, which has formed the theme of moralists and painters for centuries, and which seems to have held undisputed possession in the Latin Church from time immemorial. But as the surgeon must not be restrained by sentiment from probing a wound, or cutting off a diseased member, so we must enter upon a calm, dispassionate examination of this celebrated case.

The first proof in support of our opinion is from the Scriptures, and can be enunciated as follows: There is no passage in the Holy Scriptures that asserts or implies that Mary Magdalene was ever a woman of sin. We take for granted that the passage in Luke relating to the woman who anointed the feet of Jesus be excluded; for there is absolutely no evidence to prove that the Magdalene be that woman; and there is a valid argument which we have already adduced against it. Having excluded that text, the only texts that could with any show of probability be adduced against our position is the text of Luke VIII. 2, wherein it is stated that seven devils had gone out of Magdalene, and the text of Mark, XVI. 9.

Of course, it is not our intention to prove that Mary Magdalene was absolutely sinless. She was a sinner in that general sense in which we are all sinners; but it is our intent to prove that she was not that immoral woman, that famous converted harlot that tradition has made her.

The text of Luke asserts that seven devils had gone out of her, and the text of Mark asserts that Jesus *cast* these seven devils out of her. The advocates of the opposite opinion believe that the residence of those seven evil spirits in the woman indicates a condition of great sinfulness, and this is the only real basis of the almost universal popular persuasion concerning this woman.

Now it is true that in Matthew XII. 43, and Luke XI. 24, Christ speaks of the going out of the unclean spirit out of a man, when he means the man's conversion from sin; but we believe from the context in the passages relating to Mary Magdalene that the going out of the devils from her denotes her liberation, not from great sin, but from *demoniacal possession*. In fact, the text of Luke clearly affirms this. It is therein stated that the women who followed Jesus had been healed of *evil spirits* and *infirmities*. Certainly to be healed of an evil spirit means to be delivered from demoniacal possession. But Luke continuing in the same place, specifies some of those very women, and among these is Mary Magdalene. Even Knabenbauer admits that from this text of Luke no certain argument can be drawn for the traditional opinion of the Magdalene's antecedent sinful life. But the text of Mark must be interpreted in the light of the clearer text of Luke; and hence every Scriptural support is taken from the aforesaid traditional opinion.

When we turn to examine the traditional data in favor of the opinion which we are endeavoring to refute, we grant that the tradition is strong in the West. The tradition also in the Greek Church, through it differs from the Latin tradition in some points of the history, is quite consentient in regard to the sinful character of the Magdalene's life before her conversion.

However we find a fine testimony in support of our thesis in the First Homily of Saint Modestus, abbot of the Monastery of St. Theodosius, and afterward Patriarch of Jerusalem in 632, A. D. This testimony is cited by Photius, and is as follows: "Rightly therefore did the Lord elect Magdalene, out of whom he had cast seven devils, that he might by her expel the prince of sin from men. History says that this Magdalene, out of whom the Lord cast seven devils, was a virgin; and her martyrdom is recorded, wherein it is said that on account of her virginity and eminent purity she appeared to her executioners like pure crystal. After the death of Our Blessed Lady, the Mother of God, Magdalene went to Ephesus to the beloved disciple, where she finished her apostolic career by martyrdom. To her last breath she would not be separated from John the

Evangelist and Virgin.”—Acta Sanct. l. c. Though this testimony stands alone, it outweighs the authority of many Latin writers. It is the testimony of a prudent, able, and holy man, who was conversant with the traditions of Jerusalem where the tradition regarding the Magdalene would be more accurately preserved than in the West. It is a painful fact that many of the Western Fathers readily accepted many incredible legends, simply because they formed apt illustrations of moral doctrine. Now the theme of a repentant harlot, meriting by her sincere repentance such singular marks of love as those bestowed on Magdalene, readily appealed to Christian sentiment, and large use was made of it in moral treatises, without ever examining on what basis it stood. There was no point of doctrine or morals at stake, hence the infallible magisterium of the Church could not be invoked to safeguard the current of popular opinion in this matter: no one questioned the legend, and so it has stood to this day.

Now in justice to the truth of history, and in justice to the common rights of humanity, no woman, even though she may have lived two thousand years ago, should be represented as having been at any time immoral, unless there be adequate and certain proofs to support the charge. Of course, such false persuasion does not affect the glory and happiness of the saint in Heaven, for the glory of the saints is not dependent on the opinions of earth. They are honored, and have a right to be honored, by us, but this communion of saints is not of such nature that an erroneous persuasion of mortals would rob a saint of any degree of glory that is the saint’s due. But the cause of truth and justice among men demands that we impute no such grave charge to any human being without sufficient warrant. And what is the basis upon which the popular conception of the Magdalene rests? A confessedly erroneous exegesis of the text of Luke, a baseless conjecture that Mary Magdalene is the woman who anointed the feet of Jesus in Simon the Pharisee’s house, and the opinions of men who never examined the question *ex professo*, and who cite no authority for their opinions. Even the learned Sollerius, who certainly makes a strong presentation of the data in favor of the traditional opinion, really has nothing but the *obiter dicta* of the

Fathers, the pronouncement of the Sorbonne, and the legends of the French writers, who argue in the affair after the manner of *Cicero pro domo sua*. Any jury of just men, after hearing both sides of the evidence in a case like that of Magdalene, would render a verdict of acquittal without leaving the jury-box.

It might be asked: "Why would God permit that such a false and injurious persuasion should exist in the minds of the Christian people for so many ages?" It seems that God leaves the world much to its own resources in the matter of history and biography. The Church has ever paid her honor to Magdalene as a saint, and God did not deem it necessary to work a miracle to correct the critical error which confounded her with the woman of sin in the house of Simon the Pharisee.

No man could rightly attack any matter pertaining to faith or morals which was so widely believed by the Christian people; but the identity of the Magdalene is a matter of critical history, and must be decided independently of the infallible magisterium of the Church.

We believe that another proof of our thesis is the fact that, in all the history of the Magdalene recorded in the holy Scriptures, there is never a mention of her sinfulness, or of her repentance. There is mention of her love, of her fidelity, of Jesus' love for her; but not an intimation that she had ever been a fallen woman. Moreover the part that Mary Magdalene takes in the great events in the Gospel does not comport well with the idea that she had formerly been a public sinner. The sin of which tradition makes Magdalene guilty is that peculiar sin of woman, that, even after it is forgiven, will bring a blush of shame to the woman's cheek. It is true, by the grace of God such a degree of penitential love is possible that the sin would be completely obliterated; but such repentance does not obliterate its remembrance among men. It seems that the woman, whose shame the people of Jerusalem knew, could scarcely with propriety follow Jesus as an inseparable companion, minister to his needs, and to the needs of the Apostles, occupy the position of Magdalene in the events of the execution of the death sentence, and finally figure in that wonderful interview recorded by the Evangelists between the risen Lord

and Magdalene. It would seem that a repentance, such as that of the popular Magdalene is supposed to have been, would move her to a certain retirement away from the eyes of men who were witnesses of her shame.

We adduce this last reflection with a certain degree of timidity. God knows best what is fitting in all these matters; and if it were clearly proven that the Magdalene were a converted harlot, we would, with willing heart, acknowledge that her conduct was guided by a wisdom higher than ours; but in defect of any such certainty, it seems not irreverent to make use of such consideration to still more exalt the glory of one of the saints of God. We believe therefore that from a sober consideration of the available data, it appears that the Magdalene was not a converted harlot, but a healed demoniac, who in gratitude followed the Lord, even till he arose from the dead.

This question will be examined more fully in the course of this work.

We have now to deal with the parable proper, and the treatment will be easy, for the Lord himself has made the moral application of it to human life.

Capharnaum was the center of Jesus' Galilean ministry. Capharnaum was built on the shore of the Lake of Gennesaret. On a certain day Jesus went forth from his abode in Capharnaum, and walked down by the lakeside. A large multitude was soon gathered about him, so that the press of the crowd made speaking difficult. Jesus therefore entered into a small boat, and sat down. The people arranged themselves along the shore of the lake, and then Jesus taught them his doctrine by means of various parables, the first of which is the parable of the sower. This parable powerfully illustrates the combination of causes which effect the ruin or the success of man's eternal life. The parables of the New Testament are brief narratives founded on real scenes and events such as occur in nature, and human life, each having a moral or religious application.

To understand the event in human life on which this parable is founded, let us go back in spirit to the primitive methods of agriculture that existed in the days of the Lord.

There were in those days no grain-drills, but the seed was sown broadcast by the hand of man on the field, and covered by subsequent plowing. Let us stand in spirit by the side of the ideal field upon which the sower of the parable is operating. It borders upon the highway, and is not divided from the road by any obstruction. The sower fills a sack, which hangs suspended from his shoulder, with grain and walks in a straight line through the field scattering the grain in a uniform manner over a certain narrow strip of land by the sweep of his hand. Now as he approaches any road which borders, or intersects the field, the shower of grain cast by his hand laps over, and a portion of it falls on the hard bed of the beaten road. The portion of the grain thus falling is trodden under foot by those who pass, the plow does not cover it, and hence it is readily found by the wild birds, and devoured by them. Again, in such a field there are certain parts where the surface rock is covered with a shallow covering of soil. The sower scatters the grain with a uniform movement, and hence certain portions of it fall on these parts where the rock is but merely hidden by the soil. There is scarcely enough of soil for the plow to cover the grain, and hence not having much earth to penetrate, the blade soon appears, for the fitting conditions for germination are all present. But when the plant begins to thrust down its roots it encounters the hard rock, and the plant withers away for defect of soil.

In another portion of the field the grain falls from the sower's hand on ground having depth of soil, and fertility but in that soil lie hidden the seeds of the thistle. The same causes effect the germination of the grain and of the thistles; but these latter being of ranker growth soon choke the growing grain. We who live in a more temperate clime, have but a faint idea of the rank growth of the Oriental thistle, but suffice it to say that where it obtains full sway it would render the profitable growth of any cereal an impossibility.

And finally some grain falls from the sower's hand on good ground, and this grows to perfection, and yields a good harvest; but even here there are various degrees of perfection: some of the ground yields thirty measures for one measure sown; other parts yield sixty; and still other parts a hundred.

It may seem to some incredible that a hundred bushels of grain could be obtained from the sowing of one; but in Genesis, XXVI. 12, it is stated that Isaac sowed in the land of Gerar, and obtained in the same year a hundredfold.

Of course, under ordinary circumstances the portion of the grain that would be lost on unprofitable soil would be much less than the part that would fall upon good ground, but this proportion has nothing to do with the relative numbers of the good and the bad members of humanity.

Jesus next calls attention to the very great importance of the doctrine here promulgated in the customary formula: "He that hath ears to hear let him hear."

Up to this time the Lord had not made large use of the parable in his teachings. The Sermon on the Mount is made up of plain precepts not involved in any allegorical setting. But now there was need that he should speak more clearly of his kingdom. This kingdom should not be perfectly established until after Christ's death and resurrection, and it could not be understood fully till after that event. Hence a certain portion of Christ's doctrine must be delivered to the world in the form of allegories, which his Apostles and his Church would afterwards explain to the generations of men. The necessity of thus concealing these mysteries existed especially on account of the character of the Jewish people.

The Apostles are surprised at the change in the methods of the Master, and when they are alone with him, they ask him why he employs the parable in his teaching of the people.

In answering their question, Jesus makes use of a prophecy of Isaiah. Wherefore we shall first examine what was the sense of the original prophecy, and then endeavor to see what is its present application.

The prophecy exists in Isaiah VI. 9, 10, and reads as follows in the original: "And he said: Go, and tell this people: Hear ye continually, but understand not; and see ye continually, but perceive not. Make the heart of this people fat, and make their ears heavy, and shut their eyes: lest they see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and their heart understand, and they turn again, and be healed."

Besides the passages in the Gospels under treatment, the Isaianic prophecy is employed in Acts XXVIII. 26, and by Paul in the Epistle to the Romans XI. 8, to describe God's attitude towards the Jewish people. Hence it is important that we should, as far as possible, determine the exact import of the prophecy.

In the first place, it describes the degenerate character of the Jewish people, and secondly, it announces God's treatment of such apostate people. We are aided to an understanding of the passage under consideration by comparing it with Isaiah II. 6, 8: "For thou hast forsaken thy people, the house of Jacob, because they are filled with soothsayers like the Philistines, and they make covenants with the children of aliens. . . . Their land also is full of idols; they worship the work of their own hands, that which their own fingers have made." The Jews became thus degenerate by an abuse of God's favors to them. They were blessed by Yahveh above all the other peoples of the earth. Their prophets were the clear oracles of the living God. The Most High fought their battles, and blessed their fields. But in basest ingratitude they turned away from Yahveh, and preferred the false gods of the heathens. And then God in punishment of their impiety turned away from them, or more properly from the reprobate portion, and *permitted* a certain awful blindness of the heart, which has characterized this people ever since. This is what is meant when the prophet is bidden make the heart of the people fat, and shut their eyes. The words of the prophecy are not to be interpreted too literally. It is not affirmed that God positively by direct causality produced that blindness of heart and spiritual insensibility. God is never the direct cause of any such effect. But when a creature has maliciously, and pertinaciously abused God's grace, God permits what St. Paul calls [Rom. XI. 8] a spirit of stupor to fix itself on the soul, and then the message of God is not understood or loved by such a soul. The imperative mood used by the prophet: "Hear ye, and understand not," is a forcible way of asserting that such fact will be verified in the history of the people. It is a frequent form of prophetic diction to express some certain future fact by the employment of the imperative mood. In Acts

XXVIII. 26, Paul employs the prophecy of Isaiah, and he uses the future tense instead of the imperative, conclusively indicating thereby that the message of God to Isaiah, though expressed in the imperative mood, means the verification of a future event which God foresaw and permitted.

In like manner, when God bids the prophet: "Make the heart of this people fat, and make their ears heavy, and shut their eyes," it is equivalent to the saying: "Announce to this people, that as they have abused my grace, I will now withdraw my Spirit from them, so that a spiritual blindness shall come upon them, in such a manner that they shall see my works and hear my words, but they will not receive the great lesson which these works and words are intended to convey. They will not have understanding of these, because they have rejected the light, and the light is consequently withdrawn from them, and they are left in the darkness, which they have chosen instead of the light." There is a fearful signification in the antithetical affirmations of the prophet Isaiah: "Hear, but understand not; see, but perceive not." They represent the state of a man who has before him the evidences of religion, but whose soul is in such a state of spiritual insensibility that it regards these evidences with a blank stare.

The closing words of the prophecy do not signify that God is unwilling that the healing of his people should be effected but the words denote the nature of the effect which the spiritual condition of Israel prevented from being wrought.

The Lord quotes the prophecy not literally, but in substance. It is evident that the prophet did not refer specifically to the times of the Messiah in predicting God's attitude towards Israel. Neither does the Lord, in asserting that the prophecy of Isaiah is fulfilled, imply such fact. Isaiah spoke of conditions which existed in his own time, and which conditions revealed the perverse character of the Jewish people, and Jesus simply says: "That which was verified in the days of Isaiah respecting your hard-hearted resistance of the grace of God, is verified again in my day, and my treatment of you in consequence will be like to that which by the mouth of the Prophet the God of Israel declared to you."

The character of the Jewish people was such, that Jesus knew that they would not receive the doctrine of the kingdom of Heaven. They cared naught for a spiritual kingdom. Their hearts were coarse and dull. They were only prepared to hear of a worldly kingdom. Wherefore the Lord Jesus adopted by necessity the plan of delivering his message under such a veil of mystery that the carnal minded Israel should not penetrate the meaning; but the teaching of Jesus was of such a nature, that when his Church should take her place in the world, these truths would be understood by her and taught to every man.

But the Apostles were not like the rest of Israel. It is true that they were weak, often slow to believe, and with a limited grasp of the spiritual world; but they were not so hard and faithless as the rest of their race. Hence the Lord Jesus admitted them into a deeper insight into the great truths of his kingdom. They were to be the founders of his Church, the hope of the world; wherefore he explains the parable to these; and they kept the explanation in their hearts, and after the glorification of the Master, they taught it to the people, and wrote it for us.

Had the people of Israel been of like disposition, the Lord would have treated them as he did his chosen band, but the people of Israel by their unbelieving hearts made it impossible for Jesus to open up the truths of the kingdom to them. Hence he consigned the clearest truths of his kingdom in parables, and gave the key of these to the Apostles and to his Church.

Jesus' manner of dealing with the Jewish people and with his Apostles is illustrated by an aphorism taken from practical life. It happens that a man places in the hands of certain stewards certain goods, which they are profitably to employ for the master's benefit. On the day of reckoning he finds some who have been exceedingly faithful in advancing his interests, while others have been unprofitable. Wherefore the master takes from the unprofitable steward whatever is in his hands, and gives it into the hands of the one who has earned such trust by the fidelity with which he has administered the first trust. This is spoken of as taking from him that hath not, and giving to him that hath; for the reason that the unprofitable steward has *no fruits* of industry; while the faithful steward *has* these.

The seeming paradox of taking from him that *hath not* heightens the force of the expression. It seems to have been an aphorism among the people; and Christ employs it here to describe the character of God's retribution of man's work. It was true in its application to the Jews. God gave them a rich inheritance, and they as a people gave him no returns. We need not rely on human opinions to assert this; listen to Isaiah: "My well-beloved had a vineyard in a very fertile hill; and he digged it, and gathered out the stones thereof, and planted it with the choicest vine, and built a tower in the midst of it, and also hewed out a winepress therein: and he looked that it should bring forth grapes, and it brought forth wild grapes. And now, O inhabitants of Jerusalem and men of Judah, judge I pray you betwixt me and my vineyard. What could have been done more to my vineyard that I have not done in it? Wherefore, when I looked that it should bring forth grapes, brought it forth wild grapes? And now go to; I will tell you what I will do to my vineyard: I will take away the hedge thereof, and it shall be eaten up; I will break down the fence thereof, and it shall be trodden down; and I will lay it waste; it shall not be pruned nor hoed, but there shall come up briers and thistles; I will also command the clouds that they rain no rain upon it. For the vineyard of the Lord of hosts is the house of Israel, and the men of Judah the plant of his delight."—Is. V. 1-7. Behold the crime of Israel, and its punishment. And the Lord turned from Israel to the Gentile Church, and the returns have been better.

Though Christ's teaching treats of the deepest mysteries, it is most simple and clear. It does not explain the mysteries; for these can not be explained here. But it makes clear to man the great principles of faith and the law of conduct in a manner that the rudest mind may understand.

Before the great message received its fulfilment by the Resurrection of Jesus, there were certain things that were not understood, not even by the Apostles. The Gospel tells of many things which were hidden until our Lord rose from the dead. None of these truths were lost by their temporary obscurity. The truths were providentially preserved, and when the message was complete they were understood and delivered to us that we might believe and through faith be saved. As in

the light that came to the world through the Resurrection we read the parables of Jesus, we can not conceive more fitting presentations of religious truth. They contain the highest wisdom uttered in the beautiful simplicity of familiar illustrations. The lilies of the field, the birds of the air, the rain and the winds of heaven, the harvest fields, the laborer's wages, the love of kindred, the leavening of the bread, the shepherd's keeping of his sheep, the common occupations and customs of the people, even the housewife's sweeping of the floor, are made to teach man the high truths of God, and of our destiny. Were the choice given us, we would not that these parables be changed for any other method of teaching. And yet they were a sealed message to the Pharisees. It is a true saying that there are none so blind as those who will not see. The false hearted Jews would have rejected Christ's message in any manner in which he presented it. Christ saw their false hearts, and he chose a manner of delivering his truths which should readily be understood by every one who was honest with God, and who sought the truth, but which would puzzle and confound those whose souls were false, and who hated the light. God wished every man to come to a knowledge of the truth, but the perverted hearts of the Jews repelled the light.

These passages of Holy Writ also establish the nature of God's judgment of the lives of individuals. God has given to all of us talents which we are to use in useful spiritual industry; and woe to the one who in the accounting will be found to have misused his talents!

In the sixteenth verse of Matthew Jesus openly testifies that the Apostles were accessible to the truths of the kingdom of Heaven. Their eyes saw and their ears heard; that is to say, their souls perceived the nature of the new life with Jesus. Of course, the Apostles had not a full grasp of the great new creation, but they were docile and honest, and Jesus foresaw the day when they should reform the whole world by the power of his doctrine. And the Lord proclaims that the Apostles are indeed happy in receiving from Jesus' own lips the great glad tidings of redemption, of being eye-witnesses of Jesus' wonderful works. Ages of patriarchs and prophets had gone down to death, looking forward to the coming of the Messiah.

As St. Paul says: "These all died in faith, not having received the promised things, but having seen them and greeted them afar, and having confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth." Mark the intense joy expressed in the canticle of Simeon because his eyes had seen the infant Christ who was born to redeem the world. An equal desire and hope were entertained by the holy men of Israel, but the fulfilment was deferred. And now that hoped-for Messiah was with the Apostles, their leader, their teacher, their friend. And they were allowed to come very close to him, to live with him, and to become filled with his doctrine from close personal association. Certainly the Apostles were blessed in such a great gift of God.

And not only they, but the whole world was blessed by that event. Even the most appreciative of the sons of men will never fully realize the greatness of God's gift to humanity when he sent his Son to redeem the world. How closely humanity is bound to its Creator in the fact that a human nature and the infinite nature of the Deity are united in one person, who walked our earth and lived among us!

From the tenth verse of Mark we learn that some of Jesus' disciples were with the twelve Apostles when they obtained from Jesus the explanation of the parable of the sower.

The thirteenth verse of Mark does not really contain any chiding of the Apostles and of the disciples by Jesus. The parable of the sower is in reality easy to understand. There are many things in the teaching of Jesus more difficult to understand. And the Apostles were to receive the whole doctrine and teach it to others. Hence Jesus in the present interrogations calls the attention of the Apostles to their weakness in comparison with the greatness of the communication of divine truth that he was about to give the world. Wherefore the remark of Jesus was intended to move the Apostles to a realization of their natural insufficiency, in order that they might seek aid from God in the great commission given to them.

We come now to the explanation of the parable proper. Here our task will be easy, since the Lord has himself fully explained the same. We shall therefore only endeavor to describe those who, in our own days, correspond to the several classes mentioned in the parable.

The class represented by the seed which fell by the wayside are those whose souls are not receptive of the truths of the kingdom of Heaven. They give no time or thought to such matters; they are occupied with other matters. The seed, which is the doctrine of Christianity, can not enter into the hard soil of their souls. They occupy their time with employments, business, social pleasures, the enjoyment of the present order of things. They may not have formally rejected Christ, but neither have they formally accepted him. Perhaps at times an alarming thought of the swift passage of human life, and of the unknown beyond steals into their souls, and startles them for a moment; but it soon gives place to some practical thought of the world, and the worldly tenor of life is resumed. These men are all about us; they fill our streets; they carry on the main bulk of the mighty volume of business of our country. The tact and ability that many of them show in acquiring the goods of this world are wonderful; but when it comes to the great questions of eternity, judgment, Heaven, and God, their minds are a blank. They can not look upon the future life and the rewards of righteousness as realities. If there were promised them a heaven of grand residences on fashionable streets with large beautiful lawns in front; a heaven of fine horses and carriages and liveried servants; a heaven of gilt-edged stocks and bonds, mortgages, bank accounts and lands; and if they could see this and see others enjoying such happiness,—O, then they would move with all energy to attain that which appealed to their senses. But the high nature of the kingdom promised by Christ has no attractiveness for an unspiritual man. He lacks the temper of mind to appreciate such a state of life. His tastes are worldly. The thought of leaving this world even for Heaven is not a pleasing hope. In the great human comedy, it is grimly amusing to see the care and the forethought and the labor that these poor worldlings put into their worldly affairs. How they count their profits with intense satisfaction! And we must not understand that only the rich belong to this class. It is made up of all the ranks of life; a mighty host of unreflecting, foolish, worldly men, who never think of the needs and the destiny of the soul within them which differentiates them from the brute creation. It is a hard

class to reach with the message of Christ; for the use they make of their souls renders them as though they had no soul at all. Mere ignorance of Christ might be overcome; but with them it is ignorance combined with a lack of all desire to know the great message. No force in the mode of presentation will overcome this deadly torpor. Their souls have shrunk by the force of their cold, hard lives, and they perish as did the seed which fell by the wayside.

The next class is represented by the seed which fell upon the slight covering of soil on the surfaces of the rocks. It is easy to detect this class. They are superficial, shallow men, who have not the stability of character to endure the trials and hardships incident to the Christian life. Unlike the preceding class, these men are willing to receive Christ. They accept his law, and for a time show fervor and love of God. But then the time that tries men's souls comes upon them; the time when men have need of perseverance; and then they waver and fall.

The ordinary Christian life is exposed to many dangers. The peculiarly irreligious character of popular thought wars against faith, and exposes the poor Christian to the danger of unbelief. The force of old vicious habits steals upon him, and draws him to the old ways of sin. The drift of the world reaches out, and endeavors to draw him with it. The first fervor wears away, and the dreary battle of life begins, demanding constancy of mind and firmness of purpose; and then the sentimental part of religion vanishes, and the stern hard reality of walking in the narrow and difficult path remains. And then begin the failures. Every man who has had any experience in apostolic work knows of these sad failures. He has witnessed the poor penitent at the confessional, drawn thither perhaps by the occasion of some mission, or other extraordinary means. He has seen him go forth on the next morning after Holy Communion, and he has shuddered at the thought of what he would have to encounter in this sinful world. And too often he receives the sad news that the history of the man's life is like to that of the seed sown on the rocky places. Very often such souls succeed well enough when placed in a helpful environment. They need a prop, the helpful counsel and example

of others. But if perchance they should be thrown on their own resources, if the Church be far away or badly administered; or if the preaching be poor, then they grow remiss and drift away.

We are treating the question from a purely Catholic standpoint; for the words of Christ contemplate not many churches, but one indefectible Church, and these poor superficial souls by receiving the word for a time, thereby become members of the Catholic Church. The defect in their lives is a lack of spiritual resources, a lack of vitality of the spiritual life, the inner life. There is also a defect of a proper recognition of what the world really is.

If we were forced to live in a region infected with the most contagious of diseases, among people whom it was death to approach, what care we would employ to hold aloof from any contact with anything infected! How carefully we would employ every precaution and remedy against the disease!

And behold, our souls are living in a world whose spirit it is death to imbibe; a world whose every touch is infectious and deadly; and yet we love it, and live its life, and our souls are sick with the fever of the lust of this world. Men are greatly influenced by the conduct of those around about them, and the great mass of humanity are going with the world.

Hence it is sad to note that even with people who rank as good Catholics, their worldly life is much more real and intense than their spiritual life. You will find them, in fact, without any perceptible interior life; respectable people, and fairly correct in routine fulfilment of church obligations, but with souls enervated by spiritual drought.

Now the natural constitution of our different dispositions is a thing over which we have no control. One by nature will have more depth and stability of character than another. Such natural trait is good, and enables a man to stand firm under a heavy press of opposition. Hence, since grace perfects nature, the natural force of character aids a man in his religious life. In the unequal distribution of natural endowments, some have received more, and some have received less. It is God's work, and we cannot question his wisdom and his justice. In the judgment of human lives, he will take into account what

each one received and what fruits each has gathered. But in the present treatise, we are solely bent on discovering what remedy to propose for the man of shallow, unstable character.

Salvation is not the achievement of natural causes. No man can do anything good without the grace of God. Hence the grace of God must be invoked to supply the defect of natural character. The man who is lacking in force of character must seek aid from God, by persistent prayer. He must recognize his need, and employ every means to deepen his spiritual life. And this can be done, and God is ready to do it, if the proper dispositions are developed in the human soul. The spiritual life will grow in any soul, if it receives proper care. This growth is the deepening of the soil; and as it deepens, the seed flourishes, and the man's life assumes a real definite religious character.

It must be remarked here that men of naturally deep resourceful characters may be spiritually shallow and inconstant. The depth of the soil of a man's soul, in regard to his religious status, is simply the depth in which his nature has been penetrated by his religious convictions. And the great business of life is to make that soil deeper. It is made deeper by pious reflection, by prayer, real vital prayer, by the frequent thought of God, and by the love of God. Nothing will deepen it more than to withdraw from the world for a time, and come into the temple of God, and there talk with him in real soul-conversation. There is not enough of this; we are too busy; even our attendance at obligatory worship is often merely official, a part of the feverish unrest of our lives.

What we need therefore is a better development of the kingdom of God within us, a growth in vital piety, a closer soul-communion with God, more thought bestowed on what it really means to be a Christian, a deepening of our spiritual life, less love of this life and more love of eternal life, so that the soil of our souls may be deep enough to bear a bounteous harvest for the Lord.

The next class is represented by the seed which, after it had sprung up, was choked by the thistles. This class is easy to

recognize in society. They are the men out of whose souls religion is crowded by the love of riches and the cares of the world.

We must remark here that the Lord does not intend by the present parable to classify men in distinct classes; but only to describe vividly the different agencies that war against the spirit. Hence the causes mentioned in this third instance may produce that hardness of heart described in the first division of the parable, and they may produce that superficial grasp of religion mentioned in the second place. Presentations of moral truth are not to be treated like mathematical formulas. The Lord only wished to point out some leading characteristics of men in regard to their religious life, and to give their causes.

We have here to deal with men who have made formal profession of the Christian religion. This formal profession is indicated by the fact that the seed is received into the ground. These men also continue in the Church; for it is not said by the Evangelists that the plant dies, but, as the very accurate Luke puts it, they bring *no fruit to perfection*. Just as we have seen in fields where the weeds grow thick and rank, the useful plant is there, but stunted and weak, and devoid of profitable fruit.

The causes which choke the growth of the seed are not exactly the same in the three Evangelists. Matthew describes them as "the care of the world and the deceitfulness of riches." Mark calls them "the cares of the world, the deceitfulness of riches, and the lusts of other things." Luke enumerates "the cares and riches and pleasures of this life." But the three in substance agree: for the care of the world in its widest acceptation includes the *pleasures of this life*, and the *lusts of other things*. Mark and Luke are somewhat more explicit than Matthew. By this third part of the parable the Lord Jesus wished to affirm the injurious effects on a man's religious life of an excessive seeking after the goods of this world, and an excessive love of the enjoyment of these. Under these general headings the Lord intends to group all those things which form the object of man's worldly endeavor. The two loves in man's soul are directly antagonistic: the more a man loves this world, the more will he bend his soul's energies to possess much of it; and consequently the less will he love Heaven, and the

less will he endeavor to attain it. God's idea is that we should love this world in very small degree; or better yet, not at all, and love Heaven with all our heart; and we reverse the order, and love Heaven very little or not at all, and make an idol of this world. Let a man ask himself: What is it in my life that obtains the main part of my thought and activity? I rise in the morning with mind and body refreshed by slumber. My mind begins to think, and my body to act; and so they continue till the time of retiring. And I lie down to sleep, for I have done a day's work. And for what have I labored? Is it not for these very things that choke the good seed in my soul's life? I was put into the world to pass through it as the Hebrews passed through the wilderness. I am bidden to build here only tents for a temporary sojourn; and to set my heart on nothing that I see here. And instead I erect palaces, and settle down in them, and surround myself with all the encumbrances of this world that I can grasp, and I become oblivious of my inheritance in the kingdom of Christ. The issue can be illustrated by an easy figure. Conceive a traveler engaged in a journey on foot to a far-off land. As he journeys along, objects attract his attention by the wayside. He stops to examine them, and he finds that he loves them. He begins to collect and store them. He still believes that he can do this and yet reach his destination in time. But day by day he grows more eager to acquire these wayside objects, and the desire to reach his destination grows fainter, until finally he finds that the possible time within which he could make the journey has elapsed, and he is left to die in the plain, mocked by the possession of objects which can serve him no longer.

It is to be noted that the Evangelists speak of the *deceitfulness* of riches. Riches are deceitful in many ways. They are deceitful because they seem to be what they are not, and move men to believe that their possession insures happiness; whereas they multiply care and drive peace from the mind; and full oft the man who has given his life to attain them must confess that their use is flat, stale, and unprofitable. They are deceitful, because they invite a man to go after them, and yet they elude his grasp; and again when possessed they often slip away from a man.

But most of all, they are deceitful, because they move man to believe them a real good, and to relinquish the quest of the one only Good to go after them, and to seek in them a happiness that they can not give. No siren's song is as irresistible as their invitation, and who can estimate the multitudes that have been shipwrecked by following that invitation?

The overweening love of this world grows in the heart like the weeds in the sown field. Weeds will grow without any care or cultivation, but the profitable plant must have both. So it is with the love of the world, we take to it naturally. The weeds and the useful plant may grow side by side in the field, but if the weeds predominate, the useful plant will bring no fruit to perfection; and the weeds will predominate unless restrained by vigorous effort. So in man's life, a man may have this world in his heart, and yet profess to be a Christian; but if he really serves that world, which it is so easy to love, he will be found with nothing of consequence stored up for eternity. Again, even though weeds growing in a sown field may not choke entirely the useful plant; yet every weed that grows there takes something from the crop. So it is in man's relations to the world; every movement of his soul towards this world enfeebles just so much the heavenly aspirations and achievements of his life. The excessive love of the goods of this world crowd out of the soul of man the right thought and desire of the other life.

The excessive love of riches causes many surprises, when we come to examine closely the lives of Christians. We find in the Christian community men of prominence, professional men or business men, or the like; they move in respectable circles, occupy desirable pews in the church; all seems fair on the exterior. But by some chance we are admitted to an inside view of their lives; and there we find the fearful price that they have paid for the competency or the wealth which they enjoy. There we find the record of the lawyer's excessive fees, his acquisition of property without any just title by the tricks and technicalities of the law; there we find the record of the politician's bribe-taking, and the abuse of his office to further his own interests; there we find the record of the sharp practices and conventional dishonest methods of the man of business;

there we find the record of the unjust possession of inheritances by heirs, who made use of the technicalities of law to gain possession of property against the clearly revealed wishes of the deceased owners; there we will find the record of fraudulent claims against governments, corporations, and individuals, fraudulent and excessive damage suits; there we will find the record of money obtained by adulterating the articles of commerce; and various other records which contravene the principles of justice. And so much attached are these men to the possessions which have been acquired by these dishonest deeds that no persuasion can move them to relinquish their hold on them. Their property gives them a certain prominence; they become arrogant and proud, and thus they live and thus they die.

Manifold are the ways in which worldly cares and worldly pleasures enfeeble the soul's spirituality. The very pursuit of these develop in the soul a certain taste which counteracts the spiritual taste. Our appetites move us to eat the food which we like; and thus the soul habituated to things worldly has an appetite mainly or totally for these. A missionary records that he once visited on Christmas day a rural pastor who had received a large Christmas collection. The missionary found the pastor seated before a table on which the collection was heaped up, and the pastor was enjoying it by constantly running his hands through it, and piling it up, and as it settled down, piling it up again. It was pleasant to the sight, and to the touch. The currency, the glittering silver, and the yellow gold,—all was his; he could not get it near enough to him; every available sense was employed to heighten the joy of its possession.

The Lord's service that day consisted of a few perfunctory remarks, a mere introduction to the collection, a hurried Mass, and then with outstretched hand a personal canvass of God's people for that for which Judas Iscariot sold the Lord Jesus Christ.

Worldly cares and pleasures also choke the spiritual life by their demands on a man's time. Many become oblivious of the great aim of human life simply through lack of time. The man goes to Church with mind preoccupied by worldly

interests; he puts off reception of sacraments, and other duties through lack of time; he becomes habituated to a worldly manner of thinking and of acting, so that things of the spiritual world seem strange and unreal. Worldly success moves such a man to a certain pride and independence which are inimical to the religion of the cross. Worldly failure embitters him, and fills him with a certain cynicism. His soul is bitter and cold, and it will be hard for such a man to follow the principles of strict honesty.

Finally worldly cares move a man to deeds of injustice. In order to win in a world which adopts unjust methods the man will be tempted to adopt the prevailing methods. The man may not commit larceny as civil statute defines: there are many ways to scant justice and escape punishment in this world; but in the judgment of God hidden things will be brought to light, and strict justice will be measured out to every man. It is remarkable how the consciences of men grow callous in the undisturbed possession of ill-gotten goods. A man will not rise higher than his ideals, and the love of the riches and pleasures of the world lower man's ideals, and set the course of his life in a wrong direction.

It is easy to describe the fourth class mentioned by Christ; they are the righteous followers of Christ. They are not all equal in sanctity: some produce thirtyfold, some sixtyfold, and some a hundredfold. It is not necessary to describe the elements that make up their lives, nor the things that they have overcome. The whole body of the Gospels is aimed to teach men how to live. Hence throughout every page of the sacred deposit we shall find descriptions of their lives, and the means by which they produce the harvest for the Lord.

Inasmuch as there are various degrees of perfection in the lives of these righteous ones, we should not be content merely to enroll ourselves in their number: we should strive for the sixtyfold and even for the hundredfold.

In the texts of Mark and Luke the parable of the sower is followed by certain statements not found in Matthew. The first of these regards the lighted lamp, which is not to be placed in hiding under a vessel or under a bed. This simile seems to have been to Jesus a favorite method of illustrating moral truth.

It occurs again in Luke XI. 33, and in Matthew V. 15. In the aforesaid text of Matthew, it indicates the duty of the Apostles to preach the truths of the kingdom of Heaven to the whole world. In the present instance the illustration is cognate. Jesus Christ was the essential light of the world. His doctrine was an emanation of that essential light, and its mission was to illumine the world. The method adopted by Christ to propagate that doctrine was the teaching of the apostolic body. Here therefore he tells them that, though he veils the truths of the kingdom of Heaven now for a brief time from the multitudes, yet they are destined to be clearly presented to all mankind. The Lord frequently adverts to this design. He had come into the world to light it up. During the period of his mortal life, the nature of his mission was such that the full, clear message could not be presented to men then. But his chosen legates were taught the truths, and they were to be his lamps in the world; and by this present exhortation he encourages them to fulfill the office for which they were chosen.

In the twenty-fourth verse of Mark, there is a comparison which in other portions of the Gospels is employed to express the truth that God makes the measure of our mercy and forgiveness of others the norm of his mercy to us. But here the context plainly demonstrates that it can not be used in that sense. The conclusion of the whole passage both in Mark and Luke is in form of enunciation exactly similar to the twelfth verse of Matthew, which, as we have explained, illustrated God's dealings with the Jews. Nevertheless we believe that the passage in Mark and Luke does not relate to the Jews but to the Apostles themselves; and in general to the legates of the New Law. It seems that the Lord used the illustration twice in the present teaching; once in relation to the Jews, and secondly to illustrate how God would deal with his representatives in the New Alliance. Wherefore we believe that when, as recorded by St. Mark, Jesus declares that "with what measure ye measure, it shall be measured unto you," he means to affirm to the Apostles and their successors that the measure of the attentive study with which they heard his doctrine, and the zeal and energy with which they afterwards preached it to the world would be the measure of God's retribution unto them.

Then follows the other illustration naturally. The people of the first law were stewards, and had been unfaithful in the stewardship. And the Lord took from them the capital which had been given them, and gave it to another people, from whom he was to receive the interest that the first stewards had failed to accumulate. In the present application of the comparison Christ warns the legates of the New Law that their fate shall be similar, if they in like manner prove unfaithful.

It seems that in the eighteenth verse, Luke has weakened the force of his expression by endeavoring to take away the paradox. In the other two Evangelists the proposition stands: "— and whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken away even that which he hath." But Luke modifies it thus: "— whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken away even that which he *seemeth* to have." It seems, at first sight, a contradiction in terms to say that there is taken away from a man a thing which he has not; and we believe that Luke has endeavored to avoid this seeming contradiction by inserting the term *seemeth*. But Luke in endeavoring to avoid one seeming paradox has fallen into a greater. How can there be taken away from a man a thing which he seemeth to have, and hath not? This question is entirely independent of inspiration. The substantial idea of Christ is expressed by all three. There is only a difference in precision of style; and in the present instance we prefer the statements of Matthew and Mark.

As we have explained above, the phrase seems to have been a Hebrew aphorism, and was rendered forcible by the very fact of its seeming paradox. In the illustration Christ designates as the man who *hath not* the man who has not employed what God gave in a proper way, and consequently has not that which, in virtue of what he has received, he ought to have. From such a one is to be taken that which was entrusted to him, which has been unfruitful in his hands. The illustration centers in one great truth, that their works follow the dead into the judgment, and the rewards of God are apportioned according to men's works. As men sow thus shall they reap: as our days pass one by one we are shaping our eternal destiny, and the total of the record of our days shall determine God's judgment.

MARK IV. 26—29.

26. And he said: So is the kingdom of God, as if a man should cast seed upon the earth;
26. Καὶ ἔλεγεν: Οὕτως ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὡς ἄνθρωπος βαλῇ τὸν σπóρον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.
27. And should sleep and rise night and day, and the seed should spring up and grow, he knoweth not how.
27. Καὶ καθεύδῃ, καὶ ἐγείρεται νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν, καὶ ὁ σπóρος βλαστᾷ καὶ μηλύνεται, ὡς οὐκ οἶδεν αὐτός.
28. The earth beareth fruit of herself; first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear.
28. Αὐτομάτῃ ἡ γῆ καρποφορεῖ, πρῶτον χόρτον, εἶτα στάχυν, εἶτα πλήρης σίτος ἐν τῷ στάχυϊ.
29. But when the fruit is ripe, straightway he putteth forth the sickle, because the harvest is come.
29. Ὅταν δὲ παραδοῖ ὁ καρπός, εὐθὺς ἀποστέλλει τὸ δρέπανον, ὅτι παρέστηκεν ὁ θερισμός

In the twenty-eighth verse, we find the reading *πλήρης σίτος* in B and D. This reading is also approved by Tischendorf. *Πλήρη σῖτον* is found in **Σ**, A, C², L, Δ, Π, et al. This reading is approved by Westcott and Hort.

This short parable is recorded only by Mark. Its import is historical rather than moral. There are two chief opinions regarding the explanation of the parable. The first is presented by Knabenbauer. According to him the sower is Christ, and the seed is his personal teaching. After sowing this seed, he ascended into Heaven, and allowed the seed to grow without his visible supervision. And it did grow, and waxed strong; and he will come again at the last day to reap the harvest. There are many things which militate against this theory. It seems to remove Christ too far from the Church, to liken him to the man who sowed seed in a field, and paid no more heed to it until the time of the harvest. The Lord says himself that he will be with the Church all days, and this parable, in the sense of Knabenbauer, would make the Church grow of itself independently of Christ. But most of all, the parable plainly denotes that the seed sown in the field by the sower grew to maturity as a result of causes that did not come from the sower, "the earth beareth fruit of itself"; but no part of the

Church grows or exercises any vital act except through the causality that comes into her from her invisible head who is organically connected with his mystic body.

Wherefore we must adopt another explanation of this singular little parable. We believe that the sower is the legate of Christ, who sows the seed of the Gospel in the hearts of men.

In order to realize in its fullness the illustration, let us examine for a moment the natural basis of the parable. A man plows and harrows a field, and sows therein wheat. When he has finished the seeding, he goes away and attends to other things. He perhaps does not think of that field for the next month or two months. He gives labor to his ordinary employments by day and sleeps by night, and leaves his field to the course of nature. And all this time effects are being wrought in the field. The moisture and heat of the soil cause the seed to germinate; the fertility of the soil coupled with other natural causes produce the gradual growth and maturation of the grain; and the husbandman has no further influence upon the plant till the grain is ripened and ready for the sickle. So it is with the propagation of the Gospel of Christ. The chosen messenger sows the seed of the Gospel of Christ in human hearts. His causality stops there. Of course, other external ministrations, such as the administration of the Sacraments, and the continued exhortation of preaching are not excluded but in the interior soul of man effects are being produced in which the sower has no part.

The seed falls upon the souls of men, and the sower and the men who represent the field separate. The sower does not know what effects are being produced in the hearts of those who have heard him. The sower goes away, and does not even know those who have heard him. He may never see them again. He goes forth to sow other fields, and leaves the seed to be acted upon by other causes.

The seed is received into the souls of men. Then begin secret hidden causes to operate in the soul. They are hidden from the observation of men. The grace of God, the co-operation of the will of man, divine inspirations, interior combats, repressed temptations, acts of interior faith and love, all these

act on the seed, away from the observation and thought of the sower; and gradually, like the development of the cereal, the Christian life of the individual and the corporate life of the Church grow and produce the fruit for which Christ gave his life, and founded his Church. It is a grand illustration of the divine life of the Church, which comes to her from the resident Holy Ghost within her, and which does not depend on human causality.

The same truth is illustrated by St. Paul, I. Cor. III. 6, 7: "I planted, Apollos watered; but God gave the increase. So then neither is he that planteth anything, neither he that watereth; but God that giveth the increase."

Now there is just one objection to our explanation of the Gospel. And it is that the parable seems to imply that it is the sower who reaps the ripened grain; and certainly the reaper is the Lord. In parables it is not necessary to find a correspondence in likeness between every element of the natural event and the illustrated religious truth. It suffices that as a whole the scene or event in nature or human life serve to illustrate some moral or religious truth. The natural event contemplated in this present parable makes the sower the same who reaps the grain; but the illustrative element in the parable is the fact that the kingdom of God grows in man's soul in the same manner that the grain grows in the soil. And the harvesting of the grain is only mentioned to show that the hidden causes in the soul of men carry the growth of the plant even to its maturity, unobserved by men.

Now it would be a perverse use of this parable to draw from it that all that the apostolic man has to do is to present the message of salvation to men, and let it work. There is need "to preach the word, to be instant in season and out of season; to reprove, rebuke, and exhort with all long-suffering and teaching." There is need of zeal and unremitting labor with the people; there is need that a man become the good shepherd and give his life for his sheep; that he go in search of the strayed one into the storm and the night, and labor to bring the strayed one home; but in all these labors the apostolic man should realize that there are co-operating with him unseen divine agencies, upon whose causality the soul's conversion,

the soul's life, and the soul's growth in holiness depend. Without those agencies man's labor is lost; and compared to these agencies, the power of man's best labor is little. The laborer seeking to save souls should deeply realize the necessity of the co-operation of these divine agencies. He should attribute the effects mainly to these; he should increase these by earnest petition in his prayers; and he should rely on these, when the work seems hard or even hopeless. When the people seem cold and unspiritual, when the children seem stupid and ignorant; when in the confessional sinners seem coarse, hard, and impenitent; what consolation it is to know that the apostolic man is not alone? The unseen divine forces are at work; and though the fruits may not be immediately visible, there is cause to hope that they may come in time?

There is also a lesson of encouragement in the parable for ministers of Christ whose natural endowments are limited. Though left to themselves they are weak, with the divine forces they can accomplish great things. Some of the greatest results in the history of God's Church have been accomplished by men of meagre attainments, Witness a Henry Suso, a Curé d' Ars, and in our own times a Father Drumgoole. If the man of few intellectual talents supplements his earnest work by prayer and pious petition for God's help, the divine agencies will give the increase.

Finally, it is a consolation, when one has tried to expound some text of Scripture for the people, and after the expenditure of his best efforts, the presentation has seemed dry and commonplace—it is a consolation to know that the cause does not depend on man's human words; and that the power of God may even make of his weak words an instrument to work wondrous effects.

This was once forcibly illustrated to the writer by a personal experience related to him by a well-known parish priest. The aforesaid worthy priest was only of mediocre ability. On a certain Sunday, the morning had been unusually busy. Confessions had kept him late at his post the night before. He must preach at High Mass. The day was warm; the homily seemed dry. But it was the Master's work, and it must be done. He knelt at the altar, and asked the aid of the Holy

Ghost, and the intercession of the Blessed Virgin, and then went before the people. He tried to do his best. He spoke only simple, plain truths, things that had been heard many times before. Doubtless some who looked for sensationalism in preaching were disappointed. After the discourse the preacher himself felt sad, and disappointed. He went into his house, and the work of his ministry seemed to him almost insupportable. But consolation came. A short time afterwards, he was in his confessional, and there came to him a woman whose whole life had been a succession of deeds of shame and violence. And the woman's soul was moved to its depths by deep repentance. Hers was no mere perfunctory act, but a total change of heart. The conversion was so extraordinary that the priest asked her what particular cause had effected such a great change, and he was surprised to know that it was his very sermon that had caused him so much discouragement. And he resolved then, after he had done his best in the exercise of his ministry, never to feel discouragement. We believe that these cases are frequent; and they should encourage us all to put forth our best effort, and then cheerfully leave the result to God.

MATT. XIII. 24—30

24. Another parable set he before them, saying: The kingdom of Heaven is likened unto a man that sowed good seed in his field:

25. But while men slept, his enemy came and sowed tares also among the wheat, and went away.

26. But when the blade sprang up, and brought forth fruit, then appeared the tares also.

27. And the servants of the householder came and said unto him: Sir, didst thou not sow good seed in thy field? whence then hath it tares?

24. Ἄλλην παραβολὴν παρέθηκεν αὐτοῖς, λέγων: Ὁμοιωθή ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν ἀνθρώπῳ σπείραντι καλὸν σπέρμα ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ αὐτοῦ,

25. Ἐν δὲ τῷ καθεύδειν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, ἦλθεν αὐτοῦ ὁ ἐχθρὸς, καὶ ἐπέσπειρεν ζιζάνια ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ σίτου, καὶ ἀπῆλθεν.

26. Ὅτε δὲ ἐδλάστησεν ὁ χόρτος καὶ καρπὸν ἐποίησεν, τότε ἐφάνη καὶ τὰ ζιζάνια.

27. Προσελθόντες δὲ οἱ δοῦλοι τοῦ οἰκοδεσπότου εἶπον αὐτῷ: Κύριε, οὐχὶ καλὸν σπέρμα ἔσπειρας ἐν τῷ σῷ ἀγρῷ; πόθεν οὖν ἔχει ζιζάνια;

28. And he said unto them: An enemy hath done this. And the servants say unto him: Wilt thou then that we go and gather them up?

29. But he saith: Nay; lest haply while ye gather up the tares, ye root up the wheat with them.

30. Let both grow together until the harvest: and in the time of the harvest I will say to the reapers: Gather up first the tares, and bind them in bundles to burn them: but gather the wheat into my barn.

MATT. XIII. 31—35.

31. "Ἀλλην παραβολὴν παρέθηκεν αὐτοῖς, λέγων: Ὁμοία ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν κόκκῳ σινάπεως, ὃν λαδὼν ἄνθρωπος ἔσπειρεν ἐν τῷ ἄγρῳ αὐτοῦ.

32. Ὁ μικρότερον μὲν ἐστὶν πάντων τῶν σπερμάτων, ὅταν δὲ αὐξηθῇ, μεῖζον τῶν λαχάνων ἐστίν, καὶ γίνεται δένδρον, ὥστε ἐλθεῖν τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ κατασκηνοῦν ἐν τοῖς κλάδοις αὐτοῦ.

33. Ἀλλην παραβολὴν ἐλάλησεν αὐτοῖς: Ὁμοία ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν ζύμῃ, ἣν λαδοῦσα γυνὴ ἐνέκρυψεν εἰς ἄλεϋρου σάτα τρία, ἕως οὗ ἐξυμώθη ὅλον.

34. Ταῦτα πάντα ἐλάλησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν παραβολαῖς τοῖς ὄχλοις, καὶ χωρὶς παραβολῆς οὐδὲν ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς.

28. Ὁ δὲ ἔφη αὐτοῖς: Ἐχθρὸς ἄνθρωπος τοῦτο ἐποίησεν. Οἱ δὲ αὐτῷ λέγουσιν: Θέλεις οὖν ἀπελθόντες συλλέξωμεν αὐτά;

29. Ὁ δὲ φησιν, Οὐ, μήποτε συλλέγοντες τὰ ζιζάνια, ἐκρίζωσθε ἅμα αὐτοῖς τὸν σῖτον.

30. Ἀφετε συναυξάνεσθαι ἀμφότερα ἕως τοῦ θερισμοῦ, καὶ ἐν καιρῷ τοῦ θερισμοῦ ἐρῶ τοῖς θερισταῖς: Συλλέξατε πρῶτον τὰ ζιζάνια, καὶ δήσατε αὐτὰ εἰς δέσμας, πρὸς τὸ κατακαῦσαι αὐτά: τὸν δὲ σῖτον συνάγετε εἰς τὴν ἀποθήκην μου.

MARK IV. 30—34.

30. Καὶ ἔλεγεν: Πῶς ὁμοιώσωμεν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ; ἡ ἐν τίνι αὐτὴν παραβολῇ θώμεν;

31. Ὡς κόκκῳ σινάπεως, ὅς, ὅταν σπαρῇ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, μικρότερον ὢν πάντων τῶν σπερμάτων τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.

32. Καὶ ὅταν σπαρῇ, ἀναδαίνει, καὶ γίνεται μεῖζον πάντων τῶν λαχάνων, καὶ ποιεῖ κλάδους μεγάλους, ὥστε δύνασθαι ὑπὸ τὴν σκιὰν αὐτοῦ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατασκηνοῦν.

33. Καὶ τοιαύταις παραβολαῖς πολλαῖς ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς τὸν λόγον, καθὼς ἠδύναντο ἀκούειν.

34. Καὶ χωρὶς παραβολῆς οὐκ ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς, κατ' ἰδίαν δὲ τοῖς ἰδίοις μαθηταῖς ἐπέλευν πάντα.

35. Ὅπως πληρωθῇ τὸ ρηθὲν διὰ τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος: Ἀνοίξω ἐν παραβολαῖς τὸ στόμα μου, ἐρεῦξομαι κεκρυμμένα ἀπὸ καταβολῆς.

31. Another parable set he before them, saying: The kingdom of Heaven is like unto a grain of mustard seed, which a man took, and sowed in his field:

32. Which indeed is less than all seeds; but when it is grown, it is greater than the herbs, and becometh a tree, so that the birds of the heaven come and lodge in the branches thereof.

33. Another parable spoke he unto them: The kingdom of Heaven is like unto leaven, which a woman took, and hid in three measures of meal, till it was all leavened.

34. All these things spoke Jesus in parables unto the multitudes; and without a parable spoke he nothing unto them:

35. That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, saying: I will open my mouth in parables; I will utter things hidden from the foundation of the world.

30. And he said: How shall we liken the kingdom of God? or in what parable shall we set it forth?

31. It is like a grain of mustard seed, which, when it is sown upon the earth, though it be less than all the seeds that are upon the earth,

32. Yet when it is sown, groweth up, and becometh greater than all the herbs, and putteth out great branches; so that the birds of the Heaven can lodge under the shadow thereof.

33. And with many such parables spoke he the word unto them, as they were able to hear it:

34. And without a parable spoke he not unto them: but privately to his own disciples he expounded all things.

MATT. XIII. 36—43.

36. Then he left the multitudes, and went into the house and his disciples came unto him, saying: Explain unto us the parable of the tares of the field.

37. And he answered and said: He that soweth the good seed is the Son of man;

38. And the field is the world; and the good seed, these are the sons of the kingdom; and the tares are the sons of the evil one;

39. And the enemy that sowed them is the devil; and the harvest is the end of the world; and the reapers are angels.

40. As therefore the tares are gathered up and burned with fire; so shall it be in the end of the world.

41. The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that cause stumbling, and them that do iniquity,

42. And shall cast them into the furnace of fire: there shall be the weeping and gnashing of teeth.

43. Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father. He that hath ears, let him hear.

36. Τότε ἀφείς τοὺς ὄχλους, ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν καὶ προσήλθον αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ λέγοντες: Διασάφησον ἡμῖν τὴν παραβολὴν τῶν ζιζανίων τοῦ ἀγροῦ.

37. Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν: Ὁ σπείρων τὸ καλὸν σπέρμα, ἐστὶν ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου,

38. Ὁ δὲ ἀγρός ἐστὶν ὁ κόσμος, τὸ δὲ καλὸν σπέρμα οὗτοι εἰσὶν οἱ υἱοὶ τῆς βασιλείας, τὰ δὲ ζιζάνια εἰσὶν οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ πονηροῦ.

39. Ὁ δὲ ἐχθρός ἐστὶν ὁ σπείρας αὐτὰ, ὁ διάβολος: ὁ δὲ θερισμὸς συντέλεια. αἰὼνός ἐστιν, οἱ δὲ θερίζονται ἄγγελοι εἰσιν.

40. Ὡς περ οὖν συλλέγεται τὰ ζιζάνια, καὶ πυρὶ κατακαίεται, οὕτως ἔσται ἐν τῇ συντελείᾳ τοῦ αἰῶνος.

41. Ἀποστελεῖ ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ, καὶ συλλέξουσιν ἐκ τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ πάντα τὰ σκάνδαλα, καὶ τοὺς ποιοῦντας τὴν ἀνομίαν,

42. Καὶ βαλοῦσιν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν κάμινον τοῦ πυρός: ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων.

43. Τότε οἱ δίκαιοι ἐκλάμψουσιν, ὡς ὁ ἥλιος, ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Πατρὸς αὐτῶν. Ὁ ἔχων ὠτα ἀκουέτω.

In the twenty-fourth verse of Matthew's text we find the reading *σπείραντι* in **ℵ**, B, M, X, **Δ** and **Π**. Such reading is followed by the Coptic, Syriac, and many codices of the Vetus Itala. *Σπείρουντι* appears in C, D, E, F, G, K, L, S, U, V, **Γ**, et al. In Verse twenty-five all the uncial codices have *ἔσπειρε*, except **ℵ** and B, which have *ἐπέσπειρε*. In the same verse all the codices except B insert *δοῦλοι*. In the same verse **ℵ**, B, C and D have *λέγουσιν*. The other authorities have *εἶπον*. In the thirtieth verse B and D have *ἕως*: the other codices have *μέχρι*.

In the text of Matthew, in the thirty-second verse, the reading *πάντων τῶν λαχάνων* is found in K and **Π**, and in about eighty other uncial codices. Such reading is conformable to Mark's text, and is followed by the Vulgate, Syriac, and Ethiopian versions. In Verse thirty-three, **ℵ**, C, L, M, U, and X, add *λέγων*. In Verse thirty-four, the reading *οὐδέν* is found in **ℵ***, B, C, M, **Δ**, et al. This reading is followed by the Philoxenian Syriac, and Armenian versions, and is endorsed by the critics Tischendorf, Westcott, and Hort. *Οὐκ* is found in **ℵ**^c, D, E, F, G, K, L, S, U, V, X, **Γ**, **Π**, et al. This reading is followed by the Vulgate, the Peshitto, and Cureton's Syriac.

At the end of Verse thirty-five in Matthew, **ℵ**^b, B, **ι**, and 22 have *καταβολῆς*. This is approved by Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort. The great majority of the authorities add *κόσμου*.

In the text of Mark, in the thirtieth verse, the first term of the words of Christ is *τίνι* in A, **Δ**, **Π**, et al. This reading is adopted by the Vulgate, Syriac, Armenian, Ethiopian, and Gothic versions. *Πῶς* stands in **ℵ**, B, C, L, **Δ**, et al., and this reading is accepted by Tischendorf, Westcott, and Hort. In Verse thirty-four, B has *Καὶ χωρίς*, but the other authorities have *Χωρίς δέ*.

In Verse Thirty-six of Matthew's text many codices add *ὁ Ἰησοῦς*: it is not added in **ℵ**, B, and its omission is endorsed by Tischendorf, Westcott, and Hort. In the same verse **ℵ*** and B have *διασάφησον*, which is approved by Westcott and Hort; the other authorities support *φράσον*. In Verse thirty-seven, **ℵ**, B and D omit *αὐτοῖς*: the other codices uniformly insert it. In Verse thirty-nine, B is alone in placing the

ἐστίν after ἐχθρός. All the other codices and critics place the ἐστίν immediately preceding ὁ διάβολος. This latter order of the words seems to be preferable. In the forty-third verse, \aleph^* and B omit ἀκούειν, but the term is found in nearly all the other uncial codices, and is accepted by the Coptic and Syriac versions.

The order of the events here seems to have been that Jesus proposed to the people on this particular occasion several parables, and when he had withdrawn from the multitudes, and was alone with his disciples, he explained the parable of the cockle and the wheat.

The weed here mentioned by the Lord has never been accurately identified. It has been called tare, darnel, cockle, and bastard wheat. We are familiar with a weed which is usually found in wheat fields, and as it is impossible to determine the exact weed mentioned by Christ, we may use the cockle of our American wheat fields as an illustration. The stalk of the cockle does not much resemble the wheat. But it flourishes under the conditions proper for wheat; and its seeds are about the size and weight of kernels of wheat; and hence it is very difficult to separate it from the wheat. Some have alleged that our American cockle could not have been the weed alluded to by Christ, for the reason that it would be easy to distinguish the young plant of the cockle from the wheat; whereas they say that the parable seems to imply that the weed could not be distinguished from the wheat till the formation of the fruit. Those who argue thus take a false view of the parable. A field of wheat is not a field through which we walk and examine the individual plants. We stand by its border, and look across its green surface. If there were some plants of cockle close to the edge of the field where we stand, we could recognize them; but through the field the distinctions between cockle and wheat are all lost in the great green mass. Some careful farmers do walk through the green field of wheat, and look for the presence therein of cockle; some seek it out, and pull it up. But this does not weaken the illustrative force of the parable. The Lord accepts a common event in husbandry;

the ordinary thing that happens in human life is that the cockle growing with the wheat is allowed to grow till the harvest, and is then separated and destroyed.

The cockle grows to about the same height as the wheat, and has a very characteristic purple flower. Now the flowering of the plant is the first act in its fruit-bearing; hence from the period of its flowering till the ripening of its seeds, the cockle is very conspicuous.

It is evident that it was at the flowering period that the servants come to the master, and inform him of the presence of the cockle, and offer to pull it up. Their offer is introduced here for the sole purpose of illustrating the master's answer; such offer has no bearing on the moral import of the parable.

To walk through a field of wheat that is heading, and pull the cockle out of it, would evidently seriously damage the wheat. But as the reaping in the East was done by sickles, it would be a simple process for the harvesters to gather out the stalks of cockle before binding up the wheat.

The cockle being an extremely pernicious weed, the only proper disposition to make of it is to burn it, to save the ground from the infection of its seed.

In saying that "the kingdom of Heaven is likened to a man," etc., the Lord in substance says: "That which happens in a field, wherein is stealthily sown cockle after the sowing of good seed, happens also in a higher sense in the kingdom of Heaven."

We come now to the moral application of the parable, and aided by the Lord's own interpretation, this will be easy to make.

The Lord explains only the greater features of the parable, leaving the attendant facts to be inferred. For instance, the command of the master not to pull out the cockle is not directly explained by Christ, but its symbolic signification can be plainly inferred.

The present passage is called the parable of the tares or cockle; by which designation we are taught that its main object is to illustrate why it is that Christ has not brought all men to his following by his redemption of the world. It is a thing difficult to explain that in a world which God loved to

the extent that he gave his only Son to die for its redemption, there should be so many who know not, and love not Christ. Some might wonder why the message of redemption was not clearer, that men might be forced to accept it. This present parable is the clearest word that has been spoken concerning the deep and gloomy mystery.

The field of God is the world. The term world is here used to denote the universality of mankind; at least a universality conterminous with the extent to which Christ's doctrine shall be presented to men. The world belongs to God by the most essential titles. He created it out of nothing; he preserves it in its being; he redeemed it; he pours blessings upon it daily.

And the son of God, who is at the same time the Son of man, came forth from his eternal Father into the world, and sowed good seed. This good seed radically is the great truth of salvation; but inasmuch as these truths produce the good men who are called the sons of the kingdom, therefore Christ calls these good men the seed in the maturity of its fruit.

We must guard against an excessive literalism in explaining this figurative language. The natural constitution of the children of the kingdom of Heaven does not differ from that of evil men, as the nature of the tares or cockle differs from wheat. Moreover, the beings of the evil men do not come from Satan, as the cockle came from the enemy: good men and bad men, and all things, considered in their essences, come from God. More should not be sought from a parable than is intended to be conveyed; and a figurative presentation of a moral truth differs from the enunciation of a mathematical demonstration.

We must also be careful to distinguish between the seed as it is sown by Christ, and the seed which has grown to maturity and produced fruit. As it is sown into the world, it comprises every word of truth, every element of grace; in a word, every good agency that comes from God and operates in the world. The parable contemplates only the world after its redemption. Christ sows the seed in many ways. He sowed the seed by his divine life and personal teaching; he sowed the seed by the foundation of the Church; he sows the seed by the graces which flow from him to men through the Church; he sows the seed by

remaining with the Church all days even to the end of the world. And the fruit of all this seeding is the sons of the kingdom.

But there is another agent operating in human life; an agent whose aims and purposes are directly against Christ and against man. This is the devil, the prince of evil, the enemy of all good. And he is active; "he goes about like a roaring lion seeking whom he may devour." He also is sowing seed; not openly:

"Vice is a monster of such hideous mien,
That to be hated needs but to be seen."

But he operates stealthily, secretly. Many interpreters have taught that the fact that the enemy sowed the bad seed *while men slept* signifies that evils happen in the Church through the negligence of pastors; and that, the faithful fall into sin through lack of vigilance.

We shall examine these opinions separately; and as regards the first, we do not believe that it is contemplated in the parable.

In the first place there is no evidence that the householder administered any rebuke, when discovery was made of what had been done by the enemy while men were asleep. Again, Christ was vigilant, and yet Satan sowed his seed in the soul of Judas, even while the traitor was under the personal influence of Christ. Paul was vigilant, and yet many scandals crept into the churches which were under his immediate supervision. The first Apostles were vigilant, and yet heresies invaded the world even in the Apostles' time.

As for the second opinion, which makes the lack of vigilance on the part of the faithful responsible for Satan's invasion of their own souls, this is a truth. The faithful are exhorted to watch and pray that they enter not into temptation. This truth is certainly not excluded from the parable, but we do not think that it is mainly contemplated therein. It seems to us that if the parable were intended to convey a moral truth of such importance, Christ would have called attention to it in his interpretation of the parable. Moreover there is no natural similarity between this fact, and the scene from nature. The

parable implies that the deed of the enemy was done while the servants of the householder were asleep; and yet these are not the ones that received hurt. Wherefore we believe that this feature of the parable is introduced simply to illustrate that the devil works secretly, stealthily; that he watches opportunities when he can escape observation.

Of course, it follows that since the character of this enemy is such we must prepare ourselves to resist such secret attack. We are not sufficiently conscious of the presence of Satan as an active force in the world. In the present decrepitude of faith among practical men, the devil shares the fate of the other supernatural entities. And inasmuch as this trend of thought promotes Satan's designs, he strives to foster it by keeping himself well hid.

In the old days, when superstition and idolatry were the crimes to which men were prone, Satan made himself more manifest in the affairs of men. He is not less active now, but he has changed his methods.

The present parable also confirms the truth that the Lord is not the author of any moral evil in the universe. He sows good seed; he secures to that good seed the proper conditions for its growth and fruitfulness; there is in the world enough of good agencies operating to save the world. There is a great mystery in the fact that God permits Satan to operate in the world. But how real Satan's operations are brought out by the illustration? Who can doubt the great part which Satan has in the affairs of the world? Who can doubt that there are men in whom the seed of Satan is producing such fruit that they are called the sons of the evil one? Yea, men exchange the inheritance of the sons of God for the sonship of Satan.

In many ways men receive the seed of Satan into their souls. They receive such seed by receiving false doctrine; they receive such seed by yielding to temptation; they receive such seed by every wicked thought, word, and deed of their lives; and when the seed grows it gives a character to their lives, and the men themselves are therefore called the seed of Satan.

The servants of the householder have no counterpart in the symbolic sense of the parable; and their offer to go and pull up the cockle has no moral application. The servants and their

offer are introduced into the parable to bring out in clear relief the householder's answer; and this answer is a main feature in the spiritual sense of the parable.

The householder commanded that both wheat and cockle be allowed to grow until the harvest. So does God deal with the children of men. There is no separation here. The evil men exist intermingled with the elect of God. Some whose crimes are enormous are known to men; but no human discernment can make the accurate and complete classification. Both classes receive the common blessings of God. God's forbearance often generates in the soul of the evil man a sense of security, and of false tranquillity. The evil man succeeds as well as his pious neighbor; yea, oftentimes better. He may have heard of judgment and hell, but he has felt no hurt therefrom; they are far-off, vague thoughts, that always keep in a nebulous indefiniteness. This life with its teeming activities is so engrossing, so pleasant. This life appeals so to the present nature of man; whereas to enjoy the fruition of the other life one must pass through that strange "variety of untried being." The spiritual prospect possesses small interest for worldly men; and they hold to the present; and thus the great promiscuous mass of humanity lives its life: the good and the evil men exist side by side, and no discrimination is made till the judgment day, and then is wrought the final separation for all eternity. Just what instrumentality the angels shall exercise in that great act, we can not know: the mention of them here is simply to add vividness and force to the figure.

Hence, let no man wonder that he finds bad men in the Church of Christ. The Church is in a special manner the field of God, but Satan is allowed to sow his cockle even here; and he does sow it here, and it grows, and God allows it to remain even to the end of time. But then in that grand new order of things, all evil shall be banished from the perfect kingdom of Christ, and it shall be one eternal reign of all the good with the One Essential Eternal Good.

There is a clear promulgation of the doctrine of hell in the declaration of Christ, that all the evil ones shall be cast out of the kingdom into the furnace of fire, where there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth. This is the usual expression

of Christ to describe eternal damnation. We have before explained the import of the proposition. We shall reserve for a future chapter to explain the doctrine of hell; but we must say in passing that these repeated terrible denunciations would be a deception and a jugglery with words, unless the state of hell was endless suffering.

There is also in the present passage a forcible description of the glory of the elect in Heaven. In the speech of every land the brightness of a luminous body is used to describe the glory of an intelligent being. Undoubtedly the glory of the transfigured Lord on the Mount transcended human speech; but the inspired writers, who have transmitted to us an account of the event, can compare the glory to nothing but the light of the sun. The sun is the greatest luminary of which we have any sensible cognition and hence is aptly used to describe transcendent glory. And the Lord Jesus promises this glory to his elect.

Men have made promises to men and thereby have moved them to risk everything; to undergo the most terrible hardships and labors; and full oft leader and follower have failed, and have been left to die amid the wreck of broken hopes and disappointed ambition.

And yet what can man promise to man equal to what Jesus has promised to his followers? Eternal life; not that fitful fever that we at present have, but the fullness of life; life not subject to death, nor to any infirmity or ill, life in a higher sense than man can conceive; and possessions, the possession of the Supreme Good, the contentment of every desire, and a glory like the brightness of the sun, and all will never pass; all will be eternal,—this is the veracious promise of Christ.

And you believe it, O Christian; you can not refuse to believe it. It has the testimony of the Son of the living God; it has the testimony of the Spirit of God in your heart; and yet it does not move you as your worldly interests move you. You speak the name of Heaven with cold, unfeeling lips; you think but little of it; your thoughts and your love are down here fastened to the corruptible things of this earth. The earth, where you live a mere embryonic life, has your thoughts and your interests; and the high estate which is prepared for

you in the kingdom of Christ is not often in your thoughts. How wise is the Church in bidding us lift up our hearts? and how wise is St. Paul in declaring that our citizenship should be in Heaven? Heaven is our true country; we have no abiding habitation here; every purely worldly thought and act is a loss. We are fools, if we fix our hearts in any degree on anything but God and Heaven.

The object of Christ's present teaching is to declare the great expansion of Christianity from its humble beginnings, and its great vital penetrating force by which it permeated the entire civilized world, and reformed the character of every department of human life.

It is difficult to identify the plant here called mustard. Some believe it to be the *salvadora Indica* or *Persica*, the mustard tree, which sometimes grows to the height of twenty-five feet. But this opinion seems improbable for the reason that the plant is compared to *other herbs*; and it would be incongruous to institute a comparison between trees and herbs. Hence we believe with those who identify the plant as the *sinapis nigra*, the *black mustard*, which in Palestine in those days is said to have attained an altitude of from eight to twelve feet. Neither is this opinion weakened by the assertion of Christ that the plant *becomes a tree*; for though it belongs to the genus of herbs, its great height over the rest of the herbs justifies its being called a tree. It is said that the seeds of the tree are readily eaten by the small birds as food; hence it doubtless was a familiar sight to see these smaller birds scattered about through the branches of these great herbs, protected from the sun's rays by the leafy shade.

It must be borne in mind that these comparisons are popular expressions, wherein a mathematical exactness is not to be sought. Maldonatus declares that in Spain he had often seen mustard stalks of such size that they served for fuel for the large bread-ovens.

There is a slight difficulty in the account caused by the statement of Christ that the mustard seed is *less than all the seeds*; or as Mark puts it, *less than all the seeds that are upon*

the earth. Now botanists declare that the seed of the poppy, rue, herb sage, and other herbs is smaller than the mustard seed.

Various solutions have been proposed. Some claim that Christ took a seed which in common parlance was considered as the least of the herb seeds in that country. Others claim that the expression, *less than all seeds*, is equivalent to saying that it is *among the smallest of seeds*; and they say truly that the mustard seed was a proverbial term among the Hebrews to describe a very small quantity of matter. Another opinion asserts that the mustard seed is the smallest seed *proportionately*, that is to say, there is no seed in nature so small which produces a plant which can stand in any comparison to the mustard plant.

Still another opinion attempts to solve the difficulty by the following considerations. The mustard seed is not compared to the seed of all herbs, but to the seeds of the *λάχανα*. The *λάχανον* corresponds to the Hebrew *יֶרֶק*, and to the Latin “*olus*” or “*holus*.” The proper signification of this term in English is a kitchen herb, a vegetable. Now it is not the Lord’s intention to assert that nowhere in the world, or even in Syria, was there a smaller seed of a garden plant, but that the mustard seed was smaller than all the common seeds of the plants which the people cultivated in their gardens for their food. The Lord made use of the common concepts of the people to illustrate his doctrine; and it would be absurd to submit his statements to dialectic subtleties. We believe that this last opinion fully solves the difficulty, and that it is the most acceptable of all. And in this regard, we believe that Matthew’s presentation of the parable is better than Mark’s, and that it reveals the meaning of the Lord more clearly; for in Mark the comparison seems to be with all plants in general, whereas in Matthew it is clear that he is only speaking of the kitchen herbs.

The moral application of this parable is very simple. The kingdom of God in this place signifies the Church of Christ, which began on earth by a very humble beginning. It was founded by a poor artisan’s son, who was born in a stable, lived

without a place to lay his head, and died on a cross. Those whom the Founder appointed to carry on his work after him were not philosophers or princes, but poor ignorant fishermen. They had no worldly power on which to rely. Their doctrine was not popular. It was against the world, and the men of the world hated and despised it. It appealed to nothing that made it acceptable to worldly men. It taught men to renounce this world which we see, and touch, and use, and love, for a world which no man hath seen, and which men had to accept on faith. It asked men to renounce their popular traditions and customs, to cease to follow after earthly glory and pleasure, to hold in contempt wealth and world power, to love an unseen reality more than life itself. It taught men that the virtue of humility, which the pagan world did not have in its vocabularies, was better than pride; that it was better to receive a blow and not resist than to vanquish an enemy. It taught the strange paradox that a man must love the very man who injures him, and that a man must return good for evil. And such a religion triumphed.

There is nowhere in the history of man any event which bears any resemblance to the subjugation of the world by the Gospel of Christ. There is no event where there is such a vast disproportion between the causes and the effects. Greece was mighty; Greek civilization and culture were grand and sublime: Greece has passed away and what effect has it wrought upon the world that endures? Rome was mighty; it brought the known world under its empire by the power of its arms and the wisdom of its institutions. And its glory to-day is a historical reminiscence, and men are not affected by that glory that has faded. And the religion of Christ was the little pebble compared to the Colossus of gold, and silver, and brass, and iron and clay. Yet the dust of the Colossus is no longer discernible, on the face of the earth; while the pebble has grown into a mountain, and has filled the whole earth. The religion of Christ had no worldly art, or culture, or power; and yet it converted the world; and in all the changes of popular thought during nearly twenty centuries, it has lost none of its essential elements. Everything else in the life of man has undergone substantial changes, but the religion of Christ remains

unchanged and unchanging throughout all ages. This is the great historical miracle to prove the divinity of the religion of Christ. Its humble beginnings are supplemented by divine power; the source of its power and its undying life is in Heaven; and while it operates on earth, it receives perpetual vitality, and irresistible efficacy from its Founder in Heaven.

There is a similarity between the present parable and the passage of Ezekiel XVII. 23. Both passages by similar figures represent the humble origin, and marvellous growth of the Church of Christ.

Now there can be no essential change in the Church's method of life and growth. She can, it is true, adapt herself to new conditions of society, and new forms of government; but she can not lose her distinguishing characteristics. She must always be the humble creation, which is opposed to worldly greatness, and which grows by divine power, and triumphs, even when in the eyes of men of the world she appears to be vanquished. The spirit of the world loves "pride, fullness of bread, and prosperous ease," and relies on the power of gold and of armies. The Church of Christ loves humility, poverty, renunciation, and the chastisement of the flesh; and relies on divine power. The world shall fail, and pass as a decaying vesture; but the Church can not fail, but shall continue her mission, till she has collected all the elect into her higher realm; and then she shall exist as the bride of the Lamb forever.

The second parable illustrates the penetrating efficacy of the Church. The measure spoken of in this parable is the Hebrew seah. Its equivalent in our dry measure is about a peck and a half, being slightly less. Much has been written in explanation of the fact that the Lord speaks of *three* seahs. Chrysostom, Euthymius, Thomas, and Cajetan believe that the number three signifies the universe; St. Hilary saw therein the Law, the Prophets, and the Gospel; St. Ambrose agrees with Hilary; Bruno, Faber, Jansenius, and à Lapide believe that the three parts of the world Europe, Asia, and Africa were thereby signified. Of course America was then unknown. Theophylactus, Bede, and Rhabanus Maurus understand by the three measures three powers of the soul. St. Jerome, Paschasius and

Dionysius also refer the mystic number to the various constituents of man's being. These strange opinions were an outcome of that excessive mysticism that strove to find spiritual meanings in everything in the Scriptures. The plain truth is that Christ spoke of three seahs, because such a quantity of flour was the amount usually taken for a good-sized batch of bread. Sarah made ready three measures of fine meal for the angels at Mamre.—Gen. XVIII. 6; Gideon made unleavened cakes of an ephah, or three seahs of meal for the angel of the Lord.—Judges VI. 19; Hannah, the mother of Samuel, took the same quantity of meal as an offering to the Lord, when her child was weaned. Hence, we can readily see why the Lord for the sake of definiteness chose this particular number. The labors of others have forced us to give this prominence to this question, lest we seem careless of any matter. We are persuaded that the Lord gave no great thought to these details, but employed such terms that would be easily understood, and give a naturalness to the illustration. And the defect of many has been to spend much time on these mere details, and pass over the substance.

The process of making bread is a simple one. The flour is wet with water, and the leaven or yeast is inserted into the paste, and the mass is allowed to stand. Imperceptibly the leaven operates until it has thoroughly impregnated the whole mass. The leaven is a small quantity of matter compared to the mass of the paste; but so powerful is its action that noiselessly and without sign it permeates the mass, and effects a chemical change throughout.

And so it was with the Gospel of Christ. It was a message from Heaven thrown into the great throbbing mass of humanity. Not a mere dead word, conceived by a human brain, and spoken by human lips, but the word of life, the word of God, having in itself an intrinsic life and efficacy by which it entered into the souls of men. The men who transmitted it might die, and pass away; but the word lived and transformed the natures of men; and these in turn being thus leavened transmitted it to others, until it spread through the world, and transformed it, and made it Christian.

Men tried to stop it; strong men, having back of them the power of mighty states. And they mulcted and exiled, and imprisoned, and tortured, and slew the adherents of this strange new doctrine; and still it grew, and worked itself into every rank and condition in society, until it impregnated even the rulers of states, and transformed the laws, and made the states Christian.

Thus the word of Christ operated, and thus it operates. In hidden, secret ways it is working in the souls of men. It does not change the nature of every man; neither does the parable intend to assert this. The parable only illustrates the mode of Christianity's action, and its spread through the world. We speak it in the ears of men, and go our way, and the word begins to operate. If the man harden not his heart, it will transform him from a dead mass of gross materialism to a being endowed with spiritual life. Even he may become an agent of leavening others with the good leaven of God's word. And that leaven is spreading its operations through the world; and the end shall not come till it shall have extended its operation to every race of men.

It is probable that Jesus on this occasion spoke many other parables that are not recorded here. Matthew has omitted one that Mark records; and Mark has omitted two that are recorded by Matthew; wherefore we believe that both have omitted some that are never recorded. The reason why Jesus spoke in parables to the multitudes has already been explained; but the statement of Matthew and Mark, "that without parables he did not speak to them," needs some explanation. St. Chrysostom, Theophylactus, Euthymius, Maldonatus, Knabenbauer and others believe that it is here meant that on this particular occasion the Lord did not speak to the people except in parables. They seem moved to take this view from the fact that the Lord on subsequent occasions not always employed the parable in his teaching.

It is to be observed here that the Evangelists have grouped together a series of parables, the largest series that is recorded in the Gospels. It seems that the aforesaid phrase of Matthew and Mark should be extended even beyond this present teaching. While it is not necessary thereby absolutely to exclude

all teaching without parables, the Evangelists express that the general method of our Lord in dealing with the Jews was to employ parables to express religious truths. This is confirmed by the intrinsic evidence of the Gospels. Parables were a main factor in all the public teaching of the Lord from this time forth.

It is nevertheless true that the Evangelists' statement touching the parables would be proper and true if there was a period of our Lord's ministry in which he made such use of parables.

Mark throws a side light on this question by the clause, "— as they were able to hear it." He means to indicate thereby that Jesus suited his discourse to the character of his hearers. If there were among them honest-hearted and docile men, they might not obtain the full meaning of the parable then, but they could perceive that it was a call to righteousness, and they could keep the rest in their hearts, and they would not to have to wait long; for the light of the Resurrection was soon to burst upon the world, and then all things would be made as clear as the guidance of man's life demands.

But the men of false hard hearts received nothing from the parable; and it was not fitting that they should. The delicate nature of the truths therein contained must be, for the present, hid from these, and it was hid in parables.

As St. Mark says, the Lord expounded all things privately to his disciples. It was a prudent economy. The promoters of great enterprises confide in a few trusted ones, and keep their plans from the rest of the public until the enterprise is mature, and ready for the knowledge of the public. The foundation of Christianity was the greatest event in the history of the world, and its nature was such that it could not be wholly revealed to the people at large, until the Crucifixion and Resurrection. Those who formed the school of Christ were allowed to enter into the great event that was evolving. They had to be taught all things as clearly as they could comprehend; for after Jesus Christ had fulfilled his mission on earth, and had entered into his kingdom, the apostles of Christ were to unfold, and explain and promulgate the great message of salvation.

We have now to explain the thirty-fifth verse of Matthew, in which he declares that by the character of Jesus' discourses there was fulfilled that which was spoken by the mouth of the prophet.

It must be observed here that some of the old authorities support the reading "the prophet *Isaiah*." Such reading is found in \aleph^* , 1, 13, 124, and 253. Eusebius, Jerome and others declare that such reading was found in some of the Codices; but Eusebius affirms that it was not found in the accurate copies; and Jerome declares that it was added by unskillful scribes. Jerome conjectured that the original term was *Asaph* but the examination of the codices fails to reveal the presence of this term in any codex. It is a strange fact that Tischendorf defends the reading "*Isaiah*."

It seems to be generally accepted by the interpreters that the passage of Scripture alluded to here by the Evangelist Matthew is the second verse of the seventy-eighth Psalm, which according to the Vulgate is the seventy-seventh. The verse stands thus in the Hebrew: "I will open my mouth in a parable; I will utter dark sayings of old;" or still more literally: "I will open my mouth in a proverb; I will utter enigmas of old."

Now the title of the seventy-eighth Psalm attributes its authorship to Asaph. According to II. Chronicles, XXIX. 30, there was a seer of that name, whose words were used in the worship in the temple. The titles of the Psalms from LXXIII. to LXXXIII. inclusively attribute them to Asaph.

The common opinion of interpreters is that, inasmuch as Asaph was a seer or prophet, he is spoken of under this character by Matthew, even when quotation is made from one of his psalms. But not all the difficulty ends here. The evident meaning of Asaph in making this prefatory statement was not that he would veil deep truths under the veil of parables, but that he would discourse of God's wonderful dealings with Israel in grave sentences and comparisons. The prophet-psalmist simply calls attention to the gravity of the argument of his psalm.

A probable solution of this difficulty is proposed by Maldonatus. He believes that the Evangelist applies the

words of Asaph to Christ by a species of accommodation. Asaph and Christ were two teachers speaking to Israel of the things of God. Asaph outlined the character of his solemn discourse by declaring that he would open his mouth in parables. Now that sentence uttered by Asaph of his psalm and without any thought of Christ, finds another fulfilment in Christ's teaching. It is fulfilled in Christ's teaching, not that this teaching was therein prophesied, but for the reason that Christ's teaching had such a character that the same sentence could be said of it.

The Lord Jesus in his discourse to the people fulfilled in a deeper, truer sense what Asaph proclaimed that he would do in his psalm. In grave, deep sentences Asaph discoursed of the mighty works of Yahveh in Egypt, in the Exodus, and in Palestine. To understand Asaph's discourse, one must know intimately Israel's history from of old. It would be an enigma to one who knew not the great events of that history. In like manner Christ discoursed of God's future dealings with his new people. And his discourse is enigmatical to those who have not the key. And in the mysterious action of the Holy Ghost upon the soul of the inspired psalmist, it may have been that Asaph was moved to utter a statement containing a sense which he knew not; a sense hidden to the men of that day, and finally cleared up by Him who was the fulfilment of all prophecy.

MATT. XIII. 44-52.

44. The kingdom of Heaven is like unto a treasure hidden in the field; which a man found, and hid; and in his joy he goeth and selleth all that he hath, and buyeth that field.

45. Again, the kingdom of Heaven is like unto a man that is a merchant seeking goodly pearls:

46. And having found one pearl of great price, he went and sold all that he had, and bought it.

44. Ὁμοία ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν θησαυρῷ κεκρυμμένῳ ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ, ὃν εὗρὼν ἄνθρωπος ἔκρυψεν, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς χαρᾶς αὐτοῦ ὑπάγει, καὶ πωλεῖ ὅσα ἔχει, καὶ ἀγοράζει, τὸν ἀγρὸν ἐκεῖνον.

45. Πάλιν ὁμοία ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν ἐμπόρῳ ζητοῦντι καλοὺς μαργαρίτας:

46. Εὗρὼν δὲ ἓνα πολύτιμον μαργαρίτην, ἀπελθὼν πέπρακεν πάντα ὅσα εἶχεν, καὶ ἡγόρασεν αὐτόν.

47. Again, the kingdom of Heaven is like unto a net, that was cast into the sea, and gathered of every kind:

48. Which, when it was filled, they drew up on the beach; and they sat down, and gathered the good into vessels, but the bad they cast away.

49. So shall it be in the end of the world: the angels shall come forth, and sever the wicked from among the righteous,

50. And shall cast them into the furnace of fire; there shall be the weeping and gnashing of teeth.

51. Have ye understood all these things? They say unto him: Yea.

52. And he said unto them: Therefore every scribe who hath been made a disciple to the kingdom of Heaven is like unto a man that is a householder, who bringeth forth out of his treasure things new and old.

MATT. XIII. 53—58.

53. Καὶ ἐγένετο, ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὰς παραβολὰς ταύτας, μετήρην ἐκεῖθεν.

54. Καὶ ἐλθὼν εἰς τὴν πατρίδα αὐτοῦ, ἐδίδασκεν αὐτούς ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ αὐτῶν, ὥστε ἐκπλήσσεσθαι αὐτοῦς, καὶ λέγειν: Πόθεν τούτῳ ἡ σοφία αὕτη, καὶ αἱ δυνάμεις;

47. Ἡάλιν ὁμοία ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν σαγήνη βληθεῖση εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, καὶ ἐκ παντὸς γένους συναγαγούση:

48. Ἦν, ὅτε ἐπληρώθη, ἀναβιβάσαντες ἐπὶ τὸν αἰγιαλὸν, καὶ καθίσαντες, συνέλεξαν τὰ καλὰ εἰς ἄγγη, τὰ δὲ σαπρὰ ἔξω ἔβαλον.

49. Οὕτως ἔσται ἐν τῇ συντελείᾳ τοῦ αἰῶνος: Ἐξελεύσονται οἱ ἄγγελοι, καὶ ἀφοριοῦσιν τοὺς πονηροὺς ἐκ μέσου τῶν δικαίων,

50. Καὶ βαλοῦσιν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν κάμινον τοῦ πυρὸς, ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων.

51. Συνήκατε ταῦτα πάντα; λέγουσιν αὐτῷ: Ναί.

52. Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς: Διὰ τοῦτο πᾶς γραμματεὺς, μαθητευθεὶς τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν, ὁμοίός ἐστιν ἀνθρώπῳ οἰκοδεσπότῃ, ὅστις ἐκβάλλει ἐκ τοῦ θησαυροῦ αὐτοῦ καινὰ καὶ παλαιά.

MARK VI. 1—6.

1. Καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἐκεῖθεν καὶ ἔρχεται εἰς τὴν πατρίδα αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀκούουσι αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ.

2. Καὶ γενομένου σαββάτου ἤρξατο διδάσκειν ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ. Καὶ πολλοὶ ἀκούοντες ἐξεπλήσσοντο λέγοντες. Πόθεν τούτῳ ταῦτα, καὶ τίς ἡ σοφία ἡ δοθεῖσα τούτῳ; καὶ δυνάμεις τοιαῦται διὰ τῶν χειρῶν αὐτοῦ γίνονται;

55. Οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τοῦ τέκτονος υἱός; οὐχ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ λέγεται Μαριάμ, καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ Ἰακώβος, καὶ Ἰωσήφ, καὶ Σίμων, καὶ Ἰούδας;

56. Καὶ αἱ ἀδελφαὶ αὐτοῦ οὐχὶ πάσαι πρὸς ἡμᾶς εἰσίν; πόθεν οὖν τούτῳ ταῦτα πάντα;

57. Καὶ ἐσκανδαλίζοντο ἐν αὐτῷ. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς; Οὐκ ἔστιν προφήτης ἄτιμος, εἰ μὴ ἐν τῇ πατρίδι, καὶ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ.

58. Καὶ οὐκ ἐποίησεν ἐκεῖ δυνάμεις πολλὰς, διὰ τὴν ἀπιστίαν αὐτῶν.

53. And it came to pass, when Jesus had finished these parables, he departed thence.

54. And coming into his own country he taught them in their synagogue, insomuch that they were astonished, and said: Whence hath this man this wisdom, and these mighty works?

55. Is not this the carpenter's son? is not his mother called Mary? and his brethren, James, and Joseph, and Simon, and Judas?

56. And his sisters, are they not all with us? Whence

3. Οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τέκτων, ὁ υἱὸς τῆς Μαρίας καὶ ἀδελφὸς Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωσήτος καὶ Ἰούδα καὶ Σίμωνος; καὶ οὐκ εἰσὶν αἱ ἀδελφαὶ αὐτοῦ ὧδε πρὸς ἡμᾶς; Καὶ ἐσκανδαλίζοντο ἐν αὐτῷ.

4. Καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι, Οὐκ ἔστιν προφήτης ἄτιμος εἰ μὴ ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν τοῖς συγγενέσιν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ,

5. Καὶ οὐκ ἐδύνατο ἐκεῖ ποιῆσαι οὐδεμίαν δύναμιν, εἰ μὴ ὀλίγοις ἀρρώστοις ἐπιθεὶς τὰς χεῖρας ἐθεράπευσεν.

6. Καὶ ἐθαύμασεν διὰ τὴν ἀπιστίαν αὐτῶν. Καὶ περιῆγεν τὰς κώμας κύκλῳ διδάσκων.

1. And he went out from thence; and he cometh into his own country; and his disciples follow him.

2. And when the Sabbath was come, he began to teach in the synagogue: and many hearing him were astonished, saying, Whence hath this man these things? and, What is the wisdom that is given unto this man, and *what mean* such mighty works wrought by his hands?

3. Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary, and brother of James, and Joses, and Judas, and Simon? and are not his sisters here with us? And they were offended in him.

then hath this man all these things?

4. And Jesus said unto them, A prophet is not without honour, save in his own country, and among his own kin, and in his own house.

57. And they were made to stumble in him. But Jesus said unto them: A prophet is not without honor, save in his own country, and in his own house.

5. And he could there do no mighty work, save that he laid his hands upon a few sick folk, and healed them.

58. And he did not many mighty works there because of their unbelief.

6. And he marvelled because of their unbelief. And he went round about the villages teaching.

These two parables are very plain in character, and yet their lesson is a very important one. The first parable presents to us a man who by chance discovers a treasure hidden in a field. He is not the possessor of the field; and therefore he covers over the treasure, and goes and sells all that he possesses and buys the field that he may have the treasure. The employment of the term *θησαυρός* denotes the great value of the thing found.

Opinions differ as to the translation of the clause *ἀπὸ τῆς χαρᾶς αὐτοῦ*. Some consider the pronoun *αὐτοῦ* as the subjective genitive, and translate it "in his joy." Thus the Revised Bible of Oxford, and many modern writers. The Vulgate considers it as the objective genitive denoting the cause of the joy. This sense is admitted on the margin of the Revised Edition, and seems to be the more probable sense. The parable does not occupy itself with the question of the lawfulness of the man's act. Even an unjust act can be made the basis of the illustration of a parable. The unrighteous steward was very dishonest, and yet the Lord would have men take a lesson from his shrewd provision for the future.

Nevertheless we are disposed to examine whether the act of this man could be considered just. A treasure is an ancient deposit of money or a precious thing, of which no record is extant, and whose original owner no longer exists. The Jewish law evidently awarded such things to the finder. In the

Mishna [Cod. Sec. De Damnis II. 4] it is laid down: "If a man buys fruit of another, or if a man send a man fruits, and he to whom the fruits are sent finds in them money, the money is his."

According to the natural law a treasure is no part of the field in which it lies, and hence it follows the law of all things which have no owner; they become the property of the one who finds them first. The various codes of the world have enacted laws which govern these matters, and these laws bind in conscience; but it seems quite evident that the Hebrew law touching this thing was the law of nature itself, and it is of such a conception of the affair that Christ speaks. It seems strange that the Roman law should have modified the natural law on this point, as to give one-half of the treasure to the owner of the field. Still, if the Roman law were the accepted law of a country, no man could justly do as this man did; but considering the laws of that country where the scene is laid, he acted justly.

Now, in the moral application of the parable, three great thoughts are illustrated by it: the hidden character of Heaven, the value of Heaven, and its exclusive character.

We do not hold with some that the parable tends to prove that some men are brought into the kingdom of Heaven as it were by chance or accident. Christ has promised that they who seek shall find; he has not given any promise that men shall by chance stumble on the kingdom of Heaven. This feature is useful in the natural event; but it has no counterpart in the moral order.

The hidden character of the kingdom of Heaven is illustrated by the hidden treasure in the field. It is true that the kingdom of Heaven is spoken of as the city on the hill, as being the conspicuous object to which all the Gentiles come; but still that does not rob it of a certain hidden character. The real nature of that great kingdom does not reveal itself to the mere vulgar observers. Even such a grand spirit as that of St. Paul sees it but dimly. The kingdom of Heaven exists on earth, in Purgatory, and in Heaven. The two states that exist in the supernatural world certainly are hidden, and require the cultivation of spiritual discernment to be apprehended. The

kingdom of God on earth is a mighty organization having in her possession her divine credentials. But the superficial observer looks upon that institution, and fails to realize what it stands for. That institution has power to work divine effects, but the effects are invisible. That institution performs upon a man her solemn initiatory rite of Baptism, by which the soul is revived with the principle of spiritual life; but we hear only a verbal formulary, and witness only the pouring on of water. The great effect is hidden. The believer knows by faith that the divine effect is there; but the unbeliever turns away as from an idle ceremony. And even few of the believers realize in any considerable degree the wondrous effect.

There on the judgment seat that institution authorizes a man to sit, and in the name of Christ to absolve from sin repentant sinners, but no man can perceive by his senses that effect. It belongs to another world, the hidden world of the soul. Man has powers that can by the help of God's grace mount up to that world, not by vision, but by faith. These powers only come into use by spiritual reflection. Hence we regret in our days the increasing decadence of meditation. Mysticism and meditation are decried on the plea that they are not adapted to our practical age, and thus the devil finds in the practical character of our times a means to catch men.

The priest stands at the altar, and re-enacts the awful tragedy of Calvary. Jesus Christ in human form comes there, and is lifted up in the priest's hands for the adoration of men. Outside the temple wherein that act is operated, multitudes of men are walking, talking, sitting, working, playing, caring no more for the scene within than though it were the idle play of children. Within the church, if it be Sunday, perhaps a vast throng of worshippers are assembled. Some read their prayer books, others pray some prayer from memory, others sit idly and wait for the end. Who realizes what is being done? That which is seen is not very remarkable: it is an old ceremony, seen so often that the element of novelty is wanting to center the interest. Even a priest will be found to go through it mechanically, distractedly, never realizing what is the nature of the act which he performs.

This may be illustrated in a practical way. The Holy Mass is the highest act of man's worship. In spiritual value to man it outweighs everything else. Now let us suppose that the precept of the Church commanding men to hear Mass on Sundays were annulled, what percentage of those who now go to church would, in the event of the annulment of the command, still be found there? We are frightened by the reflection. There is only one explanation: men do not comprehend the nature and value of a Mass. No man of sane mind would throw away a treasure so great, if he knew its true nature. It is a hidden treasure.

A man lies dying. A physician is called, and pronounces that the man cannot live; he prescribes some physic to assuage the sufferings of the agony? A courier is despatched post haste for a priest. He comes, and after hearing the dying man's confession, and absolving him, he administers the sacrament of Extreme Unction. The physician remains and witnesses the ceremony. The priest anoints the chief organs of sense with a little oil, and utters a short formula of prayers; nothing more. No effect is visible. The film of death gathers in the dying eyes; he gasps a few times, and dies. Perhaps the man was one whose life was most necessary to his family, and to the community. And yet physician and priest stand there equally helpless in the hush and mastery of death. Perhaps that priest has been brought there from a long distance, at great inconvenience. If he could stay the hands of death, the physician would acknowledge his powers; but he has seemingly wrought nothing. The physician goes away musing upon the strength of ancient superstitions. And yet, perhaps the priest by the power of the Sacraments which he administered has not only stayed the hand of death, but has raised the dead soul to life. This effect is in an unseen order of being, and men do not observe it.

Thus it is with the nature and powers of the kingdom of Christ. As an existing being it is evident in the world. It is visible, and presents the motives of credibility to all men, but its inner spiritual nature cannot unfold itself to the senses of men, or to their superficial thoughts.

The next consideration that is illustrated by the parable is the great value of the kingdom of Heaven. Closely affined to this consideration is the thought of the exclusive character of the kingdom. Both considerations may be considered under one head. The man sells all that he has in order to possess the field of the treasure. That is the wisest act of a man's life, to give up all for the kingdom of Heaven. There is no rashness in such an act; it is simply the highest degree of perfection. Christ has asked us to do this: the treasure is worth the renunciation. It was the realization of this truth that moved Paul to exclaim: "Howbeit what things were gain to me, these have I counted loss for Christ. Yea verily, and I count all things to be loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord; for whom I suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but dung, that I may gain Christ, and be found in him." Philipp. III. 7-9.

The kingdom of Heaven is the only real treasure; earthly things are only apparent treasures. Earthly things will grow old, and we shall grow old in the midst of them. They will leave us, and we finally shall leave them altogether. Then, when about to leave the world, how bitter will be the regret that we have lived here as though we were to live here always?

In the parable it is laid down that the man who wished to acquire the field of the treasure sold all in order to possess it. This is equivalent to saying that he could have the field for no less price than all that he possessed. We have not given up all that we possess, and yet we expect the treasure of the kingdom of Heaven. It would make the way to Heaven too hard for weak humanity, to demand of every man the actual renunciation of every possession. Here the great leading truth is illustrated by the grandest example. It is well to hold in front of man a grand ideal. If a man aims to attain the actual degree of perfection embodied in the exemplar, he outstrips his fellow-men, and stands among the heroes. All men must move in the spirit of this man in the parable. They must prize the kingdom of Heaven above every other object; they must in the disposition of the mind be prepared, if necessary, to give up everything for that kingdom. In the following-out of this great truth, there will be various degrees of perfection. It is sad that

most men never pass beyond the very lowest degrees. Few there are who push back the sordid world, and with purified spiritual perception look aloft to the enduring things of God, and push upward to the grand goal of unworldliness and holiness.

And where is our gladness in our treasure to correspond to the joy of the man in the parable? The joy of that man was born of the realization of the great worth of the treasure which he had found. Our lives are barren of spiritual joy, because we do not realize the value of our inheritance. This realization should reflect itself in all the acts of a man's life. His prayers should be regarded as something valuable, something demanding the best effort of his mind, something that occupies a real place among the issues of his life. Then there should be a certain order in the man's life. His confessions should be frequent and earnest, his attendance at mass prompt and faithful, his interest in church work active. The great aim of all should be spiritual development, the building up of a spiritual estate. The world at large is not doing this. In its accomplishment a man should expect no encouragement, no approval from his contemporaries. A man must live a portion of his life within himself, in the world of the soul, seeking only the approval of God, and awaiting God's time for the reward of his actions. Such a man will be overlooked, brushed aside by the multitudes who struggle on to the goal of worldly prosperity; if his life is bound up with God it will not be understood by the great mass of men. The inherent loveliness of moral goodness may force men to offer a passing eulogy to such a man; but rarely will this be verified, unless the man in some way compromises with the false thought and false ideals of the day. The predominant trend of human life is to drift away from the spiritual life, and to magnify the importance of the issues of this present life. The real exponent of the spiritual speaks a language which the world does not know.

Happy the man, therefore, who hangs not on the favor of the vain world; who has a resource within himself; who needs not, and expects not, the notice and approbation of the votaries of this world to uphold him in the ends at which he aims. It has been well said that wise men are patient. The defect with

our life is that we covet the notice of men; we wish for the returns of our life's work here. It is not easy to renounce the things that the world seeks after and enjoys. It is not easy to be silent and wait in that inner world, that makes a man a stranger, even amidst the clamorous throngs of men. But it is there that man works out his true destiny. When a man's hands are already full of objects, they can not grasp another object; and when a man's soul is full of this world, it can not grasp the kingdom of Heaven.

The moral import of the parable of the pearl of great price is almost identical with that of the treasure hidden in the field. In both cases men sell all that they have to possess the object. The pearl has also the great value and the exclusive character of the treasure in the field. Religion is not one of many aims of a man's life; it is the sole supreme aim, which gives the right orientation to the whole tenor of a man's life. The more a man withdraws from everything else, and devotes himself exclusively to religion, the more he enhances the value of his proper life.

There are in the parable of the pearl some special features that illustrate some important characteristics of the Christian's life. The man is seeking goodly pearls, when he finds the pearl of great price. This establishes the obligation upon all men of seeking the end of man. First of all questions that should be solved in the life of man is: Why are we living? What is the end of man? Many things present themselves as objects of man's endeavor; but there is but one pearl of great price whose value and beauty appeal to spiritual men. In the parable perhaps multitudes of men had looked at the pearl, and had turned aside to gaudier objects. They had not the insight, the educated taste to judge the value of the pearl. And so it is in the world of the soul, men do not educate their souls to appraise their inheritance. It does not reveal its real merit like the vulgar issues of this world. Men pass this pearl by in their arduous pursuit of fortune. There is but one way to come at the true value and beauty of this pearl, and that is to educate and refine the spiritual taste, and thus bring it up to the plane of this high object. The sensual man, and the coarse slave of this world will not find the pearl of great price. It is not mean

clothes, or the hands soiled and roughened by labor that place a man low down in the scale of manhood, but it is the coarse soul, which is often found amidst the greatest wealth. In fact, we often find that the pride and haughtiness of wealth form the most effective barrier against the Spirit of God. In wealth, the soul lays itself out upon many objects; it has a world right in its grasp which it loves, and whose cares distract it. It is not seeking after the pearl of the kingdom of Heaven. It is hard, amidst the engrossing cares of wealth, to develop in the soul that spiritual character that turns a man to the exclusive search after the pearl of great price.

It is a great defect in our Christian life that we rarely apprehend the kingdom of Heaven as a treasure. The instinct is within us to acquire something, to have possessions. We look at the goods of this world, and they invite our effort. Those who have them seem to be happy, and those who have them not seem to be unhappy. The treasures in Heaven are seen by no man; society does not recognize them; the very thought of passing to the actual enjoyment of them is mixed with the disagreeable thought of death. Hence it is so much easier to direct our energies to worldly things. When we consider the nature of the object, men should seek the kingdom of Heaven with far greater zeal than they pursue temporal issues; and yet it is not so; it never has been so. A mighty transformation would be wrought in society, if men would strive to acquire sanctity with the intensity of purpose and industry with which they strive to gain riches.

The object of the man of this world is real to him; he sees it; he studies its nature, and knows its worth. Heaven is not real enough to us. We might acquire the richest treasures of Heaven, and society would not notice us. This helps to render more remote and unreal the thought of Heaven. In the ordinary life of man there is little to remind him of Heaven. The men who essay to speak of the issues of life rarely rise above the man's present life. They may proclaim that education has to deal with the spirits of men, and not with their fortunes; but they consider that spirit of man not as an heir of a super-

natural world, but as the part of man that admits of culture and refinement; that raises man out of the vulgar strata of society.

If we are desirous to possess the pearl of great price, we must set out on a journey alone; we must abandon, at the outset, the idea that men will understand us, or pay much heed to us. We must in meditation and spiritual discipline educate our souls to love the better things; we must be prepared to wait. When we witness the power and importance of men of wealth, we should console ourselves with the reflection that our possessions are of a higher order, and infinitely more enduring. The true conception of the kingdom of Heaven as a possession will not fix itself in the mind at once and without effort; it is the result of study and spiritual culture. By such effort man really emerges from the vulgar tide, and tastes the sweetness of a closer approach to the Source of all goodness. With every step upward, the soul's view grows larger, the taste is still more refined, the appreciation of the value of Heaven grows more intense. In all the great throbbing life of man, it is only this upward spiritual effort that is worth anything. Why, therefore, waste our lives in pursuing shadows? Every other possession, save the pearl of great price, will crumble into dust in the test of death: the pearl of great price is the only possession, is the only wealth which we can take with us into eternity. If we have it not, we are absolutely poor, even though we possess the whole world.

There is one characteristic of the kingdom of Heaven that can not be represented by the pearl in the parable. That pearl had a fixed value. But our subjective possession of the kingdom of Heaven varies. It always represents the sum total of the merits of a man's life. Hence with our growth in holiness, our pearl grows in value. Objectively it is infinite; we never can exhaust it. In our spiritual life there are always new worlds to conquer, new possessions to obtain. O how wonderful is the destiny of man, and how little it receives of his thought! It would seem that man could think of nothing else save that; and lo, he thinks of all things else but that.

Christ's presentation of the great issue is good; the succession of preachers who present these truths to man never fails; the defect lies in the cold, hard worldly heart of man.

Out of mystery our souls have come; into mystery they go. A great missionary and a chief of a pagan nation once sat in conference in the chief's hall. A bird flew in through the open window, and passing through the room flew out and away into the boundless air. And the man of God turned to the chief and spoke: "Such, O Chief, is thy passage through this life into eternity; and I am sent by the living God to tell thee of thy soul's life in that everlasting life into which it passes." The chief listened, obeyed, and believed; but the men of our day will not listen or think. They are all occupied with the little portion of their lives which is allotted to earth. No man ever yet found happiness by pursuing the goods of this world; no man can fail to find eternal happiness if he pursue after Heaven, and yet the folly of worldliness remains. But the love of riches gets the better of every other consideration, and the pearl of great price is passed by for the apples of Sodom.

The parable of the drag-net cast into the sea illustrates the fact that good and evil men are in the Church of God. The fisherman casts his drag-net into the sea, and hauls up whatever it encloses. He can not select the fish in such a manner that his net will only take good fish. But after the net is drawn up, then the selection is made. The sea represents the world; the drag-net is the Gospel of God operating through the organized Church. Now the great call goes out from Christ to all men; the Church opens her doors to all who will enter; but not by their mere presence in the Church are they fit to be taken into Heaven. Among the multitudes who have been taken into the Church of Christ there will always be an element to correspond to the bad fish which the fishermen cast away. The Church is often blamed for the deeds of these evil men. The present parable is her justification. The Church has not the right to cast these men out of her communion. At times, for grave public crimes, the Church does deprive a man of her communion; but in her external forum the Church does not judge the consciences of men. That separation of the wicked from the good is left for the angels to do at the command of

God, in the judgment. The Church opens her doors to the righteous and the sinner; she prays for both; she administers her sacraments to both. In doubt, she always inclines to mercy, and admits to Christian burial the dead sinner, if the faintest indication can be found that he did not give open evidence of final impenitence. What is beyond this she leaves to the judgment of God. It is often with sad misgivings that the priest pronounces over the dead body the form of absolution authorized by the Church, or blesses the body as it is lowered into the grave.

The Church labors for the whole body, but she does not do the assorting. She authorizes her ministers to sit in secret judgment, and judge the consciences of men, but the result of that examination is not for the knowledge of men, not for use in any way in the external forum. Moreover, often the judge in the tribunal of penance is unable to judge the true condition of the soul. He cannot see the souls of men; he is dependent on the penitent's recital of facts; and even granting that these are truthfully and completely stated, the judge can not be certain that the proper dispositions are in the soul of the penitent.

The Church therefore does not separate her children here; she labors for all, and leaves it for the great judgment of God to declare who is good and destined for Heaven, and who is evil and destined for hell.

Every objection that men bring against the Church of Christ can be answered by the truth here enunciated. All these objections contemplate the human element in the Church. The divine principles of her doctrine and her moral code have also been attacked, but this attack is inspired by unbelief, and the very attack is an evidence of the truth of the Church. Men put aside the Church of Christ, because they wanted a Church of free thought. They are now convinced that this was an illusion; they see that subjective faith can not exist without objective faith. The *fides qua creditur* can not live without a *fides quæ creditur*. Men are growing tired of beating the air, and groping after shadows; they are tired of rationalized, sentimentalized protestantism, and the everlasting hunger for religion moves them to desire again Christian unity and a

formal creed. Religion was founded by a definite creed; it grew and converted the world by a formal creed; and those who have rejected the definite creed of the one true Church of Christ have become dead branches of the tree.

But when men object that there have been evil men in the Church the charge is true. They were predicted by Christ. They have been found in the mass of the people, and among the ministers of Christ. They have climbed into the highest posts; they have done evil deeds; but they have not perverted the doctrine of the Church; they have not made void her sacraments, nor contaminated her moral code. Their presence in the Church is not an argument against the Church; for it is not the human element in the Church that demands men's faith and that affords salvation. They are instruments, ministers of a great power; but there is a higher power above them which preserves the Church through everything. It is therefore sheer ignorance to reject the Church on account of the corruption that has been found in her ministers. There never was an age in which the Church had not her saints among her ministers and among her people; there never was an age in which she did not fulfill her mission of saving men. Notwithstanding the weakness of some of her members, hers is a glorious history. Her impress is on everything good in civilization, and those who reject her claims enjoy the benefits which she has vouchsafed to society. Let not men judge her by her unworthy sons; judge her by her doctrines and by her moral code and by the countless multitudes of her saints in every age.

The rejection of the wicked by God is of a character to strike terror into the heart of sinful man; but the message is aggravated by the statement that those who are rejected will be cast into the furnace of fire.

We have already written something on the theme of hell. A fuller treatment of the sad truth will be given in our Commentary on the judgment of God, as described in the twenty-fifth chapter of Matthew. It is worthy of note that in Matthew's Gospel this is Christ's fifth reference to the doctrine of

hell. The other references are V. 29, VIII. 12, X. 28, and XII. 32. Such frequent and emphatic declarations of the doctrine attest its truth and importance.

Jesus Christ was the Teacher of teachers. The truths by him delivered to the Apostles were to be transmitted by them to the generations of men. Some of these truths were to be understood by the Apostles immediately; other truths were to unfold themselves in the light of subsequent events. These parables were a plain statement of the nature of the kingdom of Heaven, and of man's duty; they were intended to be understood at once. Hence the Saviour, in the character of a perfect Master, asks them if they understood the parables. Whenever there was need of it, Jesus explained his parables in private to the Apostles. He was forming them to be the teachers of mankind, and hence they must first understand the doctrine.

In the present instance the Apostles promptly answer, Yes. Thereupon Jesus declares to them what shall be their function in the kingdom of Heaven. The Old Law had its scribes who explained the Law to the people; the Apostles were to exercise a corresponding office in the Church of Christ. He exhorts them to make ample provision for this work by likening their provision to the rich storehouse of a householder. From this well-filled store the householder brings forth, as occasion requires, things new and old. In some things freshness is a desirable quality; in other things age adds to the value. Thus the spouse in the Cantic of Canticles declares:

“At our doors are all manner of precious fruits new and old,
Which I have laid up for thee, O my beloved.”—VII. 13.

We shall not undertake to specify what things were old, and what things were new. A man who can, at will, bring forth things old and new is taken as a representative possessor of a goodly storehouse. And when the illustration is applied to the moral order, it outlines the duty of the scribe of the New Law, to be well versed in the doctrines of Christ, so that from the abundance of his heart his mouth may speak words of truth and edification. It is not intended that we should seek in the doctrines of the New Law what are the old things, and what the

new. That is not the point of the illustration. Christ merely exhorts to have a well stocked mind, to be a ready scribe in all things that pertain to the Law of Christ. This should be the exclusive labor of the scribe's life; he should be ever studying the kingdom of Heaven, and equipping his mind to present it well to men. Much reading of the Scriptures of God will do much in filling the mind of the minister of the New Law; the study of the doctrines of the Church in her approved authors must have a large part in the man's equipment. The scribe of the New Law must be a student of truth in its widest acceptance; he must be a man of intellectual and moral vitality, and then that which he brings forth for the people will have the charm of life about it. He will establish a bond of sympathy between himself and the people; he will transmit to them something of his own intense belief.

All these parables of the Lord were spoken down in Capernaum. At their conclusion, Jesus went up to Nazareth and taught there. From the similarity of the present account to the text of St. Luke IV. 16—24, many believe that the two accounts describe one event. This has the best extrinsic authority, and is certainly very probable. The same motives actuate the people, and the same results are verified. Even if we grant that there were two events, we must admit that they were of the most similar character, and what has been said in regard to the aforesaid passage of Luke in Volume I. is also applicable here. The townspeople of Nazareth could not understand how the humble son of the artisan Joseph had acquired his great power and wisdom. There was nothing remarkable in his origin, as they judged things. They knew his mother Mary; they knew his kinsmen, and his kinswomen. They were ordinary people among the poor citizens of Nazareth. This consideration held them back from acknowledging the true character of Jesus Christ, and this justified the Evangelist's declaration that they were made to stumble in Jesus. They heard his wonderful words, and heard of his mighty works, but the faith that these evidences should have begotten stumbled and fell on reflection that Jesus was in his human origin the son of a poor woman of Nazareth, the kinsman of their neighbors.

From the fact that St. Joseph is not said to be among them the tradition is justified that at this juncture he was dead.

There is also evidence in this account that St. Joseph was a carpenter. He is called here a τέκτων, and the ordinary, signification of this term is a carpenter. Cajetan and Maldonatus believe that the term may denote a blacksmith, bronze-smith, or carpenter. Hilary asserts that St. Joseph was a blacksmith.

In Mark, Jesus himself is called a τέκτων, a carpenter. Celsus alleged this against Jesus as a reproach, and in his answer Origen [C. Cels. VI. 34] denied that Jesus is thus called in the Gospels. This passage must have escaped his notice, or he must have accepted another reading of the text. It certainly is highly probable that St. Joseph was a carpenter, and that Jesus labored in the same occupation. How labor is honored by the life of Jesus! How sad that the laborer at his work does not think of the Lord himself who was also a laborer, instead of thinking of sinful themes, and disgracing his labor by discontent, dishonesty, profanity, and obscenity!

MATT. XII. 46-50.

46. Ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος τοῖς ὄχλοις, ἰδοὺ ἡ μήτηρ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ εἰστήκεισαν ἔξω, ζητοῦντες αὐτῷ λαλήσαι.

47. (Εἶπεν δέ τις αὐτῷ: Ἴδου, ἡ μήτηρ σου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί σου ἔξω ἐστήκασιν, ζητοῦντές σοι λαλήσαι).

48. Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς, εἶπεν τῷ λέγοντι αὐτῷ: Τίς ἐστὶν ἡ μήτηρ μου, καὶ τίνες εἰσὶν οἱ ἀδελφοί μου;

49. Καὶ ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τοὺς μαθητάς αὐτοῦ, εἶπεν: Ἴδου ἡ μήτηρ μου, καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί μου.

50. Ὅστις γὰρ ἂν ποιήσῃ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Πατρὸς μου τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς, αὐτός μου ἀδελφός, καὶ ἀδελφή, καὶ μήτηρ ἐστίν.

MARK III. 31-33

31. Καὶ ἔρχονται ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔξω στήκοντες ἀπέστειλαν πρὸς αὐτόν, καλοῦντες αὐτόν.

32. Καὶ ἐκάθητο περὶ αὐτὸν ὄχλος, καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ: Ἴδου, ἡ μήτηρ σου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί σου ἔξω ζητοῦσίν σε.

33. Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτοῖς, λέγει: Τίς ἐστὶν ἡ μήτηρ μου, καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί;

34. Περιβλεψάμενος τοὺς περὶ αὐτὸν κύκλῳ καθημένους, λέγει, Ἴδε ἡ μήτηρ μου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί μου.

35. Ὃς ἂν ποιήσῃ τὰ θελήματα τοῦ Θεοῦ, οὗτος ἀδελφός μου, καὶ ἀδελφή, καὶ μήτηρ ἐστίν.

46. While he was yet speaking to the multitudes, behold, his mother and his brethren stood without, seeking to speak to him.

47. And one said unto him, Behold, thy mother and thy brethren stand without, seeking to speak to thee.

48. But he answered and said unto him that told him: Who is my mother? and who are my brethren?

49. And he stretched forth his hand towards his disciples, and said: Behold, my mother and my brethren!

50. For whosoever shall do the will of my Father who is in Heaven, he is my brother, and sister, and mother.

31. And there come his mother and his brethren; and, standing without, they sent unto him, calling him.

32. And a multitude was sitting about him; and they say unto him: Behold, thy mother and thy brethren without seek for thee.

33. And he answereth them, and saith: Who is my mother and my brethren?

34. And looking round on them which sat round about him, he saith: Behold, my mother and my brethren!

35. For whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother.

LUKE VIII. 19-21.

19. And there came to him his mother and brethren, and they could not come at him for the crowd.

20. And it was told him: Thy mother and thy brethren stand without, desiring to see thee.

21. But he answered and said unto them: My mother and my brethren are these who hear the word of God, and do it.

19. Παρεγένετο δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἡ μήτηρ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ οὐκ ἠδύναντο συντυχεῖν αὐτῷ, διὰ τὸν ὄχλον.

20. Ἀπηγγέλη δὲ αὐτῷ: Ἡ μήτηρ σου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί σου ἐστήκασιν ἔξω, ἰδεῖν θέλοντές σε.

21. Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς: Μήτηρ μου καὶ ἀδελφοί μου οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀκούοντες καὶ ποιῶντες.

The forty-seventh verse of Matthew is wanting in N*, B, and Γ. The cause is apparent. The main portions and endings, of the forty-sixth and forty-seventh verses are identical; and hence the forty-seventh has been omitted on account of the homoeoteleuton.

In the thirty-second verse of Mark *καὶ αἱ ἀδελφαί σου* is found in A, D, E, F, H, M, S, U, V, and Γ. In Verse thirty-five, B alone has the plural *θελήματα*: the other authorities have *τὸ θέλημα*.

In the nineteenth verse of Luke the singular *παρεγένητο* stands in B, D, X, 50, and 71; the other authorities have *παρεγένοντο*.

It is quite impossible to fix the exact order of this present event. In the accounts of Matthew and Mark it precedes the parables; in Luke's Gospel it follows them. In general, Luke has the better chronological order; but there are times when it is evident that he has been unable to trace the order of events. Such we believe to be the present case; and all that we can say with certainty is that the event was connected with the preaching of the parables here near the Lake of Gennesaret.

Let us in spirit transport ourselves to the scene. When our Lord spoke to the multitudes the parable of the sower, he was seated in a boat near the western shore of the Lake of Gennesaret. But the words and deeds of Jesus were they all written, would fill many volumes. Hence all the writers of the New Testament group events together that are separated by intervals of days. From the fact that a series of parables is here narrated, it is not implied that they were all delivered on the same day. We are persuaded that we have only a condensation of the teaching that extended over several days.

It is evident that when the present event occurred, the Lord was upon the land. A very great multitude were seated round about him listening to his doctrine. And his mother and brethren come up, and can not come near him on account of the great crowd. Those here called the brethren of the Lord are his cousins. It is a well known Scriptural usage to speak of all collateral kinsmen as brethren. It is not necessary to determine just who they were; opinions on this point vary. The term *brethren* implies in nowise that they were uterine brothers of the Lord; and the singular character of the Mother of God, as described in the Holy Scriptures, proves to evidence her perpetual virginity. The explanation of Luke I. 34, shows how absurd it would be to believe that there was ever any carnal union between St. Joseph and the Blessed Virgin.

It would have been the profanation of the holiest temple that ever was on earth; it would offer a base insult to the divine person of Jesus himself. And even in a practical sense, if the Mother of God had other sons, why do not they come forth more prominently in the history of the Son of God? Why is Mary commended to the care of St. John by Jesus from the cross, if she had sons to care for her? The whole history of the Holy Family shows clearly that Mary, without carnal union with man was the Virgin Mother of one only Son, and that he was the Son of God.

It would be interesting to know the motive which moved Jesus' Mother and his kinsmen to seek to approach him at this time. It may have been a mother's solicitude for the safety of her Son that prompted Mary to seek Jesus; and the others may have shared her fears. Dark rumors of plots and stratagems must have been abroad. The Pharisees were determined to overthrow this man who was destroying their credit with the people. The greatness of Mary's love for her divine Son so intimately bound up her life with his divine life that everything that affected his life affected hers in equal degree. We have seen how once before she came to him in the midst of his teaching in the temple. Her love stopped at no obstacle.

Though we can not determine the specific motive that underlies the action of those who here come to seek Jesus, we are sure that it was a good and pious one, as the Mother of Jesus is a chief actor in the event.

As the dense crowd surrounding Jesus shut off all access to those on the outside, word is passed in through the crowd to Jesus that his Mother and kinsmen are without, and that they wish to see him. And then comes the central point in the whole narrative, the Lord's answer. Those sitting closest to our Lord at the time were his Apostles and disciples. Looking round upon these, he stretches forth his hand and points them out to the multitudes, and says: "These are my mother, and my brothers; for he who shall do the will of my Father who is in Heaven, he is my brother, and sister, and mother."

What our Lord did subsequently we know not. The event would never have been recorded, were it not for the lesson contained in Jesus' words. It is therefore with these that we

have mainly to deal. From the earliest times, the servants of Satan have striven to rob Mary of her prerogatives and glory as Mother of God. Such men readily construe the present words of Jesus to mean that Mary was no more to Jesus than any other creature. The Christ of their fancy must be a cold, unnatural being, devoid of one of the noblest sentiments that moves the heart of man. We believe that the right understanding of these words will leave to Mary, a mother's rightful place, above all angels and all saints in the kingdom of her Son.

In mankind the love of parents and kindred is a private, particular love. It is founded not on the virtues of the subjects but merely on the ties of blood. It is natural and good, implanted by the God of nature in the human heart. Christ was a perfect man, and he felt this love. But Christ was also the Son of God, and he loved all men with an ineffable love. Such love could only be felt by him. This great love prevented any merely private interest from being a motive of his acts. He had come to redeem the world; he loved the whole world; his life belonged to the whole world. He could not narrow his life by any private interest. He loved the whole world, and had redemption for the whole world; but he loved the good, those who did his Father's will, with a special love. In the measure in which men possess this goodness, in that measure does Jesus Christ love them. He loves most the holiest person on earth. Now this grand universal love is above any private love. But in relation to Mary the superlative degree of the two loves are united. He loves her with a natural love, as the most perfect of sons loves the most perfect of mothers. He loves her with the superlative degree of his universal love, because she is the most perfect of all mere creatures. Had there been on earth a creature more virtuous, more holy than the Mother of God, Jesus Christ would have loved such creature more than he did his Mother. But such fact would have been an anomaly; and to harmonize the divine and the human state of things the Omnipotent God selected such a being for the Mother of the Son of God, and filled her with such graces, that she has no superior, or even equal in creation. Of course, in all these comparisons we do not bring

into comparison the created humanity of Jesus Christ; for that is a unique work in a special order of creation, and can not be likened to any other created thing.

It is a beautiful thought, that the two motives are united in the love of Jesus for his Blessed Mother. Nothing less would be fitting. The relations of a mother to her child are so intimate that a consideration of Mary's maternity persuades us that she was the most perfect representative of humanity. The flesh of the Son of God, that flesh that now in a glorified state sits at the right hand of the Almighty Father, was formed of Mary's body. How could we conceive that there could be anything in mankind purer or holier than the being from whose body was made the sacred flesh of the Son of God? The Holy Scriptures bear clear witness to the matchless sanctity of Mary; but if all other proofs were wanting Mary's greatness is clearly attested by the Church of Christ whose infallible authority is all-sufficient in every matter of Christian belief.

In the present passage therefore Christ is simply asserting that his love is not a restricted, private love. He is not denying that he loves his Mother, and his kinsmen; but he is asserting that high above this is that grander universal love, wherein men enter by acts of virtue. He is asserting also that his life was not to be devoted to any private interest, even for those whom he loved. His life belonged to humanity; and the ties of blood, *considered merely as such*, were subordinate to the great work of the redemption of the world.

Jesus' words say no more than that the great work of Redemption of which his disciples were the firstfruit took precedence of love of kindred considered as such. The everlasting love which Jesus bore to his Mother did not clash with Jesus' universal love for mankind; but at times Jesus withdrew his presence from his Mother in order to do the great work of salvation. He did not love her less or honor her less by this conduct; he allowed her thereby a certain participation in his own great life of sacrifice. In calling his disciples his mother and his kindred, Jesus does not exclude his love of his Mother and kindred. He needs not love these less in order to love humanity with his universal love. The natural love of kindred in Jesus was not allowed to draw him away from what Jesus

in another place calls his Father's business. He was engaged in preaching the word of God when his Mother and kindred came up; and Jesus makes of the occasion a means to teach men how dear to him are those who do his Father's will. Jesus' words will often contain depths of meaning which we cannot fathom; for his thoughts are not our thoughts. This will especially be verified in those things where the human and the divine blend their manifestations in incomprehensible harmony. No man can comprehend the divine life of Jesus. We are aided to understand what is needful by the Church in which resides the Holy Spirit; and the Church gives the proper honor to the Mother of God.

Some valuable moral reflections may be drawn from the present fact. In the first place we are taught thereby that God's work is above every interest. Very often, in order to fulfill one's duty is promoting the work of God we must set aside the private love of family and of friends. The more a man becomes like to Christ, the more universal becomes his love of man, and the more does he raise all private loves, and merge them into that grand universal love of all men and especially of all the elect of God.

Again, we can not become the Mother of Jesus or his kinsmen, but we can enter into that grand universal love of Jesus for his redeemed creature; we can grow in that love, and advance by acts of faith and love ever higher and higher even to the end.

MATT. VIII. 18; 23—27.

18. Ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὄχλον περὶ αὐτόν, ἐκέλευσεν ἀπελθεῖν εἰς τὸ πέραν.

23. Καὶ ἐμβάντι αὐτῷ εἰς πλοῖον ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ.

24. Καὶ ἰδοὺ σεισμὸς μέγας ἐγένετο ἐν τῇ θαλάσῃ, ὥστε τὸ πλοῖον καλύπτεσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν κυμάτων: αὐτὸς δὲ ἐκάθευθεν.

MARK IV. 35—41.

35. Καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, ὁψίας γενομένης: Διέλθωμεν εἰς τὸ πέραν.

36. Καὶ ἀφέντες τὸν ὄχλον, παραλαμβάνουσιν αὐτόν ὡς ἦν ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ, καὶ ἄλλα πλοῖα ἦν μετ' αὐτοῦ.

37. Καὶ γίνεται λαίλαψ μεγάλη ἀνέμου, καὶ τὰ κύματα ἐπέβαλλον εἰς τὸ πλοῖον, ὥστε ἤδη γεμίζεσθαι τὸ πλοῖον.

25. Καὶ προσελθόντες ἤγειραν αὐτόν, λέγοντες: Κύριε, σῶσον, ἀπολλύμεθα.

26. Καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς: Τί δειλοί ἐστε, ὀλιγόπιστοι; τότε ἐγερθεὶς ἐπετίμησεν τοῖς ἀνέμοις, καὶ τῇ θαλάσῃ, καὶ ἐγένετο γαλήνη μεγάλη.

27. Οἱ δὲ ἄνθρωποι ἐθαύμασαν, λέγοντες: Ποταπὸς ἐστὶν οὗτος, ὅτι καὶ οἱ ἄνεμοι καὶ ἡ θάλασσα αὐτῷ ὑπακούουσιν;

18. Now when Jesus saw great multitudes about him, he gave commandment to depart unto the other side.

23. And when he was entered into a boat, his disciples followed him.

24. And behold, there arose a great tempest in the sea, inso-much that the boat was covered with the waves: but he was asleep.

25. And they came to him, and awoke him, saying: Save, Lord; we perish.

26. And he said unto them: Why are ye fearful, O ye of little faith? Then he arose, and rebuked the winds and the sea; and there was a great calm.

38. Καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν ἐν τῇ πρύμνῃ, ἐπὶ τὸ προσκεφάλαιον καθεύδων. Καὶ διεγείρουσιν αὐτόν, καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ: Διδάσκαλε, οὐ μέλλει σοι ὅτι ἀπολλύμεθα;

39. Καὶ διεγερθεὶς ἐπετίμησεν τῷ ἀνέμῳ, καὶ εἶπεν τῇ θαλάσῃ: Σιώπα, παφίμωσο, καὶ ἐκόπασεν ὁ ἄνεμος, καὶ ἐγένετο γαλήνη μεγάλη.

40. Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς: Τί δειλοί ἐστε; οὐπω ἔχετε πίστιν;

41. Καὶ ἐφοδῆθησαν φόβον μέγαν, καὶ ἔλεγον πρὸς ἀλλήλους: Τίς ἄρα οὗτός ἐστιν, ὅτι καὶ ὁ ἄνεμος καὶ ἡ θάλασσα ὑπακούει αὐτῷ;

35. And on that day, when even was come, he saith unto them: Let us go over unto the other side.

36. And leaving the multitude, they take him with them, even as he was, in the boat. And other boats were with him.

37. And there ariseth a great storm of wind, and the waves beat into the boat, inso-much that the boat was now filling.

38. And he himself was in the stern, asleep on the cushion: and they awake him, and say unto him: Master, carest thou not that we perish?

39. And he awoke, and rebuked the wind, and said unto the sea: Peace, be still. And the wind ceased, and there was a great calm.

27. And the men marvelled, saying: What manner of man is this, that even the winds and the sea obey him?

40. And he said unto them: Why are ye fearful? have ye not yet faith?

41. And they feared exceedingly, and said one to another: Who then is this, that even the wind and the sea obey him?

LUKE VIII. 22-25.

22. Now it came to pass on one of those days, that he entered into a boat, himself and his disciples; and he said unto them: Let us go over unto the other side of the lake: and they launched forth.

23. But as they sailed he fell asleep: and there came down a storm of wind on the lake; and they were filling with water, and were in jeopardy.

24. And they came to him, and awoke him, saying: Master, master, we perish. And he awoke, and rebuked the wind and the raging of the water: and they ceased, and there was a calm.

25. And he said unto them: Where is your faith? And being afraid they marvelled, saying one to another: Who then is this, that he commandeth even the winds and the water, and they obey him?

22. Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν, καὶ αὐτὸς ἀνέβη εἰς πλοῖον, καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ: καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς: Διέλθωμεν εἰς τὸ πέραν τῆς λίμνης: καὶ ἀνήχθησαν.

23. Πλεόντων δὲ αὐτῶν, ἀφύπνωσεν. Καὶ κατέβη λαίλαψ εἰς τὴν λίμνην ἀνέμου, καὶ συνεπληροῦντο καὶ ἐκινδύνευον.

24. Προσελθόντες δὲ διήγειραν αὐτόν, λέγοντες: Ἐπιστάτα, ἐπιστάτα, ἀπολλύμεθα. Ὁ δὲ διεγερθεὶς ἐπετίμησεν τῷ ἀνέμῳ καὶ τῷ κλύδωνι τοῦ ὕδατος, καὶ ἐπαύσαντο, καὶ ἐγένετο γαλήνη.

25. Εἶπεν δὲ αὐτοῖς: Ποῦ ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν; φοβηθέντες δὲ ἐθαύμασαν, λέγοντες πρὸς ἀλλήλους: Τίς ἄρα οὗτός ἐστιν, ὅτι καὶ τοῖς ἀνέμοις ἐπιτάσσει καὶ τῷ ὕδατι (καὶ ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ);

. In Matthew's text, in Verse eighteen, B has ὄχλον, but most authorities have πολλοὺς ὄχλους. In the twenty-third verse most of the authorities insert the article τό before πλοῖον: it is omitted in \aleph^b , and C. In verse twenty-five οἱ μαθηταὶ does not appear in \aleph and B; neither is the reading found in the

Sahidic and Bohairic versions. The authority of the greater number of uncial codices favors the reading. The pronoun ἡμᾶς is omitted after σῶσον in \aleph , B and C.

In Verse thirty-six of Mark *πλοιάρια* is found in E, F, G, H, L, S, U, V, et al. In Verse forty, *οὕτως* is found in A, C, Π, et al. Tischendorf favors this reading. It is omitted in \aleph B, D, L, and Δ . Westcott and Hort favor the latter reading; and it is followed by the Vulgate, Coptic and Ethiopian versions. The authorities that favor *οὕτως* in the first member of the verse support *πῶς* in the second member. The others defend *οὕπω*.

In the text of Luke, in the twenty-fifth verse, *ἔστιν* is omitted in \aleph , A, B, C, and X. The last phrase of this same verse, *καὶ ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ*, is omitted by B.

Though they who accompanied Jesus on the voyage across the lake are called *disciples*, it is evident that his *Apostles* are meant thereby. The Apostles were a select body of his disciples, and they are often mentioned by the generic term.

A detail is mentioned by St. Mark that has been omitted by all the other Evangelists. It is, that "they take Jesus with them, even as he was, in the boat." There seems only one reasonable explanation of this; and that is that Jesus had been teaching the multitudes while sitting in the boat, and that without descending thence, he bade his Apostles to go over to the other side. The account of Mark simply implies that Jesus remained in the boat in which he was sitting, and thus started for the opposite shore.

Our Lord had a true human nature, and he was capable of fatigue; and being thus fatigued, he withdrew into the stern of the boat, and lay down on a sort of cushion, and slept. This sleep had been foreseen and fore-ordained to a high purpose by the Lord Jesus.

It is probable that, when they entered the boat, and began the voyage, the Lake of Gennesaret was calm. The account seems to imply that the violent storm of wind came up suddenly. The Lake of Gennesaret lies in a depression of about 620 feet below the level of the sea; hence Luke's phrase is very graphic, "there came down a storm of wind on the lake."

The lake is undoubtedly the extinct crater of a volcano, and its formation probably goes back to prehistoric times.

The Lake of Gennesaret is pear-shaped, the broad end being toward the north. The greatest width is six and three quarters miles from Mejdel, "Magdala," to Khersa, "Gergesa," about one-third of the way down. The extreme length is twelve and a quarter miles. From actual experience I can testify of the suddenness and violence of the storms of the Sea of Galilee. On May 17, 1905, in company with others of the Biblical School of Jerusalem I entered into a small sail-boat on the aforesaid lake. We set out from Tiberias for the opposite shore. The lake was perfectly calm. Without warning the wind suddenly arose and compelled us with some danger to make for the southern shore. We were also obliged to keep close to shore on our way back. All who know aught of the lake speak of the suddenness of these storms. See *A Diary of My Life in the Holy Land*.

All Evangelists concur in describing the violence of the storm; the waves broke over the boat, and the boat was filling with water.

Bede, Paschasius, Thomas, Dionysius the Carthusian, Salmeron, Maldonatus and à Lapide believe that this storm was produced by Jesus' miraculous power, for the purpose of furnishing an occasion of teaching his Apostles the lesson of faith. Others believe that the storm arose by natural causes, and that Jesus, foreseeing such event, bade the disciples undertake the journey having in mind to use the storm to teach his own the great lesson of faith. Both opinions are very probable and we are unable to decide which to embrace. In fact, a full understanding of the whole event may be obtained without deciding the specific cause of the storm.

In the midst of the wild commotion of the elements, while the Apostles tremble, and fear that at any moment the bark may sink, Jesus sleeps on. Though we believe that the continuance of his sleep during the storm was the effect of natural causes, nevertheless we believe that it was foreseen, and fore-ordained by the Saviour as a factor in the great lesson that he was about to teach men.

It was a test of faith, and an aid to faith. The frightened Apostles now come to Jesus, and arouse him, crying out to him to save them from perishing. Mark adds that they spoke complainingly to Jesus: "Master, carest thou not that we perish?"

And Jesus arose, and stood calm and majestic there in the midst of the storm. And he gently chides them for their lack of faith. They should have known that no evil could befall them while Jesus was with them in the boat. Jesus does not charge them with having no faith. The fact that they come to him in their fear, and ask his help, shows that they in some degree believed in him; but it was not the faith that they ought to have had; for they had seen many miracles wrought by Jesus, and they should have known that his presence in the boat insured their safety.

Jesus could have calmed the tempest and the waves from where he lay by a word, or by the unspoken act of his will; but the effect would not have so forcibly impressed the disciples. Therefore he arose, and stood erect in his majesty as Lord of nature, and gave command to the winds and to the sea, as a man would issue an order to a servant; and the winds obeyed his word, and a great calm settled upon the sea. The sudden cessation of the storm, and the immediate tranquility of the waves attest the miracle. In the course of nature, the winds would have died away gradually, and the sea would have grown calm by degrees. But in the present case, nature obeyed a higher power, and acted in obedience to a higher law.

Nothing more forcibly brings home to man his weakness than a great storm. This is pathetically brought out by Shakespeare in the tragedy of King Lear, wherein he describes the poor mad king as one who:

"Strives in his little world of man to out-scorn
The to-and-fro conflicting wind and rain."

No storm is so fearful as a storm on the waters. In the awful conflict of wind and wave man feels how puny and insufficient is his best effort to make head against the mighty forces of nature. This sense of utter helplessness was felt by the Apostles in the event that we are describing. It was the proper condition of soul in preparation for the miracle; for the

greatness of their distress heightened their appreciation of the miracle, and drew them to a greater trust in him who was supreme over the mightiest forces in nature.

By events of this kind, by many and varied manifestations of power the Lord Jesus developed faith in his Apostles. That faith received a fearful shock in the events of the Crucifixion; but after Jesus had arisen, and especially after the Apostles had received the Holy Ghost, their faith became strong; then they remembered these events in the life of Jesus, and they believed with a perfect faith, and drew others to a like belief. The proving force of the event is plain and strong. There is no power supreme above nature save the power of God. Had any being who was not God, or who was not speaking in God's name, spoken to the winds and to that wild tumult of waters, the only effect would have been the mocking echoes of his own voice.

It is to be noted that Jesus did not petition his Father in this place that the storm might cease, but simply addressed the elements in his own name, and bade them cease their wild commotion. The Lord had many lessons to teach us; and thus in the various miracles he shapes his mode of action to teach different lessons. In the present case, he wished to teach that he is the co-equal Son of God, the Supreme Lord of nature, and that they who trust in him are safe, even though the mightiest forces in the universe be combined against them.

Very many beautiful moral applications can be made of the event. Its first great moral application was in the lives of the first Apostles. They were destined to do a work that would meet with opposition. They were destined to do a work in which human aid was entirely inadequate to help them. They were to give their lives to an enterprise against which would be pitted the mightiest forces of the world. Their cause was not to succeed suddenly. It was to be hated, and despised. The storm on the Lake of Gennesaret is a type of the terrible storm of persecution and suffering which that chosen band was to encounter in going forth to teach the nations. Cowards could never do that work. It required men having a noble contempt of danger, suffering, and death. It required men who would

turn back from no storm. The event on the Lake of Gennesaret had left an enduring memory in their minds that they were safe while Jesus was with them. When he sent them forth to evangelize the world, he promised that he would be with them. Encouraged by the consciousness of his abiding presence, they knew that they could not fail. In the storm on Lake Gennesaret they trembled with fear at the impending danger; but after their baptism with the Pentecostal fire, they faced death without a shudder. For they knew that the Lord Jesus was with them, and that he would save them from any harm; they knew when they had done their work, that he would allow them to follow himself by dying for the great cause of Christianity; but this was not an abandoning of them to the fury of the storm, but the merciful receiving of them into the great kingdom of life, away from the storm, after their work was completed.

We may also consider the event a type of the life of the Church. The Church is the bark of Peter carrying souls across the stormy sea of the world to the kingdom of Christ. The storm of wind and wave represents the various hostile agencies that war against the Church. Of itself that bark would have long since disappeared from the earth; but Jesus Christ is in her. He permits the storm to rage, and to distress that bark, for the same reason that he slept while Gennesaret's waves were filling the Apostles' boat. He does this that men may trust him even in the face of death. Many a time it has seemed to the world that the Bark of Peter must succumb to the dreadful storm that set upon it. It had not gone far on its journey before the mighty power of the Roman Empire rose up to crush it. The waves rose high, and for a time the bark was scarcely visible; and the Roman emperors proclaimed that it had been annihilated. But the bark arose again, and kept on its course. For over three centuries the storm lasted and then there came a calm.

But the normal life of the mariners in that bark is not that of calm and comfort, but of warfare against the world, and of suffering. The Bark of Peter had now entered upon the high seas, and the storms from all quarters dashed upon it. The storms were not always of the same character.

When the Roman persecutions ceased, then arose the heresies. The waves of Arianism, of Nestorianism, of Eutychi-anism, of Manicheism, of Pelagianism, and of many other famous heresies, dashed upon the Bark of Peter. It is true that some of the mariners lost faith in the bark, and left her; but she triumphed over those dreadful storms, and kept on. The sea was never absolutely calm; some waves were always beating upon her; but after the dying away of the early heresies the bark had a somewhat easier voyage. The absence of violent storms engendered a spirit of comfort-seeking, and worldliness in many of those mariners. Then came the great storm of the Greek schism, in which the great mass of the Christians of the East abandoned the bark of Peter. The effect of that storm was terrible, but still the bark continued its course.

Then came a storm compared to which all the preceding ones are insignificant. A series of internal scandals, dissensions, and crimes prepared the way for the storm; and then it came in the form of the great protestant apostasy of the sixteenth century. In that awful crisis strong men lost heart. The storm shook the whole world, and changed its social and political status. Not only was the Bark of Peter beaten upon by the storm from without, but she was also betrayed and ravaged by many unfaithful mariners from within. That storm has never subsided. The worldly forces, which formerly opposed the religion of Christ, now make an ally of protestantism, and use the name and semblance of a religion to persecute the Church of Christ. She has lost all the high places of power and wealth in the state; but the Bark of Peter sails on, the only hope of humanity in a sad, wicked world.

What mighty changes she has witnessed in the life of man since she began her voyage? There have been great political changes, social changes, industrial changes; the thought of the world, and the institutions of men have all changed; but the Church of Christ is the same to-day as it was in the beginning, and thus it ever shall be. For she was not begun as the raw, imperfect effort of man. Her divine Founder established her as a perfect creation. He is within her, and she can not change

nor die. She shall be tossed and beaten by storms, even to the end; but peace awaits her, when she shall reach the haven to which she is sailing.

Finally, we may make a profitable application of the lesson of the event to our own lives. The stormy Sea of Gennesaret is a type of the life of man. Every life has its storms. At times the violence of the storm is so great that ruin seems inevitable. And often, at such times, it seems that God is far off, and that no response comes to our prayers. And we grow fretful, and complain of God; or perhaps, worst of all, our minds fill with bleak, cold doubts and sullen despair. And yet Jesus is only sleeping to test our faith. If our lives are upright, our faith strong, and our love intense, Jesus will be with us always, and even though he hide his presence, we should fear no storm while he is with us. Remember that God says to his faithful soul: "Because thou wast acceptable to God, it was necessary that thou shouldest be tempted." The marks of God's predilection are not peace, prosperity and absence of temptation, but combat, tribulation, and temptation. The storm may take the form of bodily infirmity, poverty, temptations, or of interior desolation. The waves may dash over us. We should not fear: Jesus is with us, even though he seem to have abandoned us.

Historians tell us that on a certain day Julius Cæsar entered into a boat, and requested the rowers to take him over a certain body of water. When about the middle of their course, a storm arose, and the rowers feared. Thereupon Cæsar addressed them thus: "Fear not; ye carry Cæsar." Vain boast of human pride! What could the power of Cæsar avail against the power of the elements? But the Christian can truly say: "I shall fear no storm; for I have with me him whom the winds, and the sea, and all things obey."

The Evangelists Mark and Luke tell us that after Jesus had calmed the storm, the Apostles feared exceedingly. St. Matthew says that the men marvelled. It is probable that Matthew includes in the term *the men*, those, who were in the other boats; for St. Mark states that "other boats were with him." It is but natural that in the presence of a being of such mighty power men should experience a feeling of awe. They

did not yet know the true character of Jesus; but they said one to another: "Who then is this, that even the wind and the sea obey him."

MATT. VIII. 28—34.

28. Καὶ ἐλθόντος αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ πέραν εἰς τὴν χώραν τῶν Γαδαρηνῶν ὑπὴντησαν αὐτῷ δύο δαιμονιζόμενοι ἐκ τῶν μνημείων ἐξερχόμενοι, χαλεποὶ λίαν, ὥστε μὴ ἰσχύειν τινὰ παρελθεῖν διὰ τῆς ὁδοῦ ἐκεῖνης.

29. Καὶ ἰδοὺ ἔκραξαν λέγοντες, Τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί, Υἱὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ; ἦλθες ὧδε πρὸ καιροῦ βασανίσαι ἡμᾶς;

30. Ἦν δὲ μακρὰν ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἀγέλη χοίρων πολλῶν βοσκομένη.

MARK V. 1—20.

1. Καὶ ἦλθον εἰς τὸ πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης εἰς τὴν χώραν τῶν Γερασηνῶν.

2. Καὶ ἐξελθόντος αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου, ὑπὴντησεν αὐτῷ ἐκ τῶν μνημείων ἄνθρωπος ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ.

3. Ὃς τὴν κατοίκησιν εἶχεν ἐν τοῖς μνήμασιν, καὶ οὐδὲ ἀλύσει οὐκ-έτι οὐδεὶς ἐδύνατο αὐτὸν δῆσαι.

4. Διὰ τὸ αὐτὸν πολλάκις πέδαις καὶ ἀλύσει δεδέσθαι, καὶ διεσπᾶσθαι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τὰς ἀλύσεις, καὶ τὰς πέδας συντετριφθαι, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἴσχυεν αὐτὸν δαμάσαι.

5. Καὶ διὰ παντὸς νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας, ἐν τοῖς μνήμασιν καὶ ἐν τοῖς ὕρρεσιν ἦν κράζων, καὶ κατακόπτων ἑαυτὸν λίθοις.

6. Καὶ ἰδὼν τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀπὸ μακρόθεν, ἔδραμεν, καὶ προσεκύνησεν αὐτόν.

7. Καὶ κράξας φωνῇ μεγάλῃ, λέγει: Τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦ Υἱὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου; ὀρκίζω σε τὸν Θεόν, μὴ με βασανίσῃς.

8. Ἐλεγεν γὰρ αὐτῷ: Ἐξελθε, τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἀκάθαρτον ἐκ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

9. Καὶ ἐπηρώτα αὐτόν: Τί ὄνομά σοι; καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ: Λεγεὼν ὄνομά μοι ἐστίν, ὅτι πολλοὶ ἐσμεν.

10. Καὶ παρεκάλει αὐτὸν πολλὰ ἵνα μὴ αὐτὰ ἀποστείλῃ ἔξω τῆς χώρας.

11. Ἦν δὲ ἐκεῖ πρὸς τῷ ὕρρει ἀγέλη χοίρων μεγάλῃ βοσκομένη.

31. Οἱ δὲ δαίμονες παρεκάλουν αὐτὸν, λέγοντες: Εἰ ἐκβάλλεις ὑμᾶς, ἀπόστειλον ἡμᾶς εἰς τὴν ἀγέλην τῶν χοίρων.

32. Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς; Ὑπάγετε. Οἱ δὲ ἐξελθόντες ἀπῆλθον εἰς τοὺς χοίρους: καὶ ἰδοὺ ὥρμησεν πᾶσα ἡ ἀγέλη κατὰ τοῦ κρημνοῦ εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, καὶ ἀπέθανον ἐν τοῖς ὕδασι.

33. Οἱ δὲ βόσκοντες ἔφυγον, καὶ ἀπελθόντες εἰς τὴν πόλιν, ἀπήγγειλαν πάντα, καὶ τὰ τῶν δαιμονιζομένων.

34. Καὶ ἰδοὺ πᾶσα ἡ πόλις, ἐξηλθεν εἰς ὑπάντησιν τῷ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ ἰδόντες αὐτὸν παρεκάλεσαν ἵνα μεταβῇ ἀπὸ τῶν ὁρίων αὐτῶν.

12. Καὶ παρεκάλεσαν αὐτὸν, λέγοντες: Πέμψον ἡμᾶς εἰς τοὺς χοίρους, ἵνα εἰς αὐτοὺς εἰσέλθωμεν.

13. Καὶ ἐπέτρεψεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἐξελθόντα τὰ πνεύματα τὰ ἀκάθαρτα εἰσῆλθον εἰς τοὺς χοίρους, καὶ ὥρμησεν ἡ ἀγέλη κατὰ τοῦ κρημνοῦ εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν ὡς δισχίλιοι, καὶ ἐπνίγοντο ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ.

14. Καὶ οἱ βόσκοντες αὐτοὺς ἔφυγον, καὶ ἀπήγγειλαν εἰς τὴν πόλιν καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἀγρούς: καὶ ἦλθον ἰδεῖν τί ἐστὶν τὸ γεγονός.

15. Καὶ ἔρχονται πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν, καὶ θεωροῦσιν τὸν δαιμονιζόμενον, καθήμενον ἱματισμένον, καὶ σωφρονοῦντα; τὸν ἐσχηκότα τὸν λεγεῶνα, καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν.

16. Καὶ διηγῆσαντο αὐτοῖς οἱ ἰδόντες, πῶς ἐγένετο τῷ δαιμονιζομένῳ, καὶ περὶ τῶν χοίρων.

17. Καὶ ἤρξαντο παρακαλεῖν αὐτὸν ἀπελθεῖν ἀπὸ τῶν ὁρίων αὐτῶν.

18. Καὶ ἐμβαίνοντος αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ πλοῖον, παρεκάλει αὐτὸν ὁ δαιμονισθεὶς, ἵνα μετ' αὐτοῦ ᾖ.

19. Καὶ οὐκ ἀφῆκεν αὐτόν, ἀλλὰ λέγει αὐτῷ: Ὑπάγε εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου πρὸς τοὺς σοὺς, καὶ ἀπάγγειλον αὐτοῖς ὅσα ὁ Κύριος σοὶ πεποίηκεν, καὶ ἐλέησέν σε.

20. Καὶ ἀπῆλθεν, καὶ ἤρξατο κηρύσσειν ἐν τῇ Δεκαπόλει, ὅσα ἐποίησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ πάντες ἐθαύμαζον.

28. And when he was come to the other side into the country of the Gadarenes, there

1. And they came to the other side of the sea, into the country of the Gerasenes.

met him two possessed with devils, coming forth out of the tombs, exceeding fierce, so that no man could pass by that way.

2. And when he was come out of the boat, straightway there met him out of the tombs a man with an unclean spirit,

3. Who had his dwelling in the tombs: and no man could any more bind him, not even with a chain;

4. Because that he had been often bound with fetters and chains, and the chains had been rent asunder by him, and the fetters broken in pieces: and no man had strength to tame him.

5. And always, night and day, in the tombs and in the mountains, he was crying out, and cutting himself with stones.

6. And when he saw Jesus from afar, he ran and worshipped him;

29. And behold, they cried out, saying: What is to us and to thee, thou Son of God? art thou come hither to torment us before the time?

7. And crying out with a loud voice, he saith: What is to me and to thee, Jesus, thou Son of the Most High God? I adjure thee by God, torment me not.

8. For he said unto him: Come forth, thou unclean spirit, out of the man.

9. And he asked him: What is thy name? And he saith unto him: My name is Legion; for we are many.

10. And he besought him much that he would not send them away out of the country.

30. Now there was afar off from them a herd of many swine feeding.

31. And the devils besought him, saying: If thou cast us out, send us away into the herd of swine.

32. And he said unto them: Go. And they came out, and went into the swine: and behold, the whole herd rushed down the steep into the sea, and perished in the waters.

33. And they that fed them fled, and went away into the city, and told everything, and what was befallen to them that were possessed with devils.

34. And behold, all the city came out to meet Jesus: and when they saw him, they besought him that he would depart from their borders.

11. Now there was there on the mountain side a great herd of swine feeding.

12. And they besought him saying: Send us into the swine, that we may enter into them.

13. And he gave them leave. And the unclean spirits came out, and entered into the swine: and the herd rushed down the steep into the sea, in number about two thousand; and they were choked in the sea.

14. And they that fed them fled, and told it in the city, and in the country. And they came to see what it was that had come to pass.

15. And they come to Jesus, and behold him that was possessed with devils sitting, clothed and in his right mind, even him that had the legion: and they were afraid.

16. And they that saw it declared unto them how it befell him that was possessed with devils, and concerning the swine.

17. And they began to beseech him to depart from their borders.

18. And as he was entering into the boat, he that had been possessed with devils besought him that he might be with him.

19. And he suffered him not, but saith unto him: Go to thy house unto thy friends,

and tell them how great things the Lord hath done for thee, and how he hath mercy on thee.

20. And he went his way, and began to publish in Decapolis how great things Jesus had done for him: and all men did marvel.

LUKE VIII. 26—39.

26. And they arrived at the country of the Gerasenes, which is over against Galilee.

27. And when he was come forth upon the land, there met him a certain man out of the city, who had devils; and for a long time he had worn no clothes, and abode not in any house, but in the tombs.

28. And when he saw Jesus, he cried out, and fell down before him, and with a loud voice said: What is to me and to thee, Jesus, thou Son of the Most High God? I beseech thee, torment me not.

29. For he commanded the unclean spirit to come out from the man. For oftentimes it had seized him: and he was kept under guard, and bound with chains and fetters; and breaking the bands asunder, he was driven of the devil into the deserts.

30. And Jesus asked him: What is thy name? And he said, Legion; for many devils were entered into him.

26. Καὶ κατέπλευσαν εἰς τὴν χώραν τῶν Γερασηνῶν, ἥτις ἐστὶν ἀντίπερα τῆς Γαλιλαίας.

27. Ἐξεληθόντι δὲ αὐτῷ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, ὑπήντησέν τις ἀνὴρ ἐκ τῆς πόλεως, ἔχων δαιμόνια, καὶ χρόνῳ ἱκανῷ οὐκ ἐνεδύσατο ἱμάτιον, καὶ ἐν οἰκίᾳ οὐκ ἔμενεν, ἀλλ' ἐν τοῖς μνήμασιν.

28. Ἰδὼν δὲ τὸν Ἰησοῦν, ἀνακράξας προσέπεσεν αὐτῷ, καὶ φωνῇ μεγάλῃ εἶπεν: Τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦ, υἱὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου; δέομαί σου μή με βασανίσῃς.

29. Παρήγγειλεν γὰρ τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀκαθάρτῳ ἐξελθεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. Πολλοῖς γὰρ χρόνοις συνηρπάκει αὐτόν, καὶ ἐδεσμεύετο ἀλύσειν καὶ πέδαις φυλασσόμενος, καὶ διαρρήσων τὰ δεσμά, ἠλαύνετο ἀπὸ τοῦ δαιμονίου εἰς τὰς ἐρήμους.

30. Ἐπηρώτησεν δὲ αὐτόν ὁ Ἰησοῦς: Τί σοι ὄνομά ἐστιν; ὁ δὲ εἶπεν: Λεγεών, ὅτι εἰσῆλθεν δαιμόνια πολλὰ εἰς αὐτόν.

31. And they intreated him that he would not command them to depart into the abyss.

32. Now there was there a herd of many swine feeding on the mountain: and they entreated him that he would give them leave to enter into them. And he gave them leave.

33. And the devils came out from the man, and entered into the swine: and the herd rushed down the steep into the lake, and were drowned.

34. And when they that fed them saw what had come to pass, they fled, and told it in the city and in the country.

35. And they went out to see what had come to pass; and they came to Jesus, and found the man, from whom the devils were gone out, sitting, clothed and in his right mind, at the feet of Jesus; and they were afraid.

36. And they saw that it told them how he that was possessed with devils was made whole.

37. And all the people of the country of the Gerasenes round about asked him to depart from them; for they were seized with great fear: and he entered into a boat, and returned.

38. But the man from whom the devils were gone out prayed him that he might be with him: but he sent him away, saying:

31. Καὶ παρεκάλουν αὐτὸν ἵνα μὴ ἐπιτάξῃ αὐτοῖς εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον ἀπελθεῖν.

32. Ἦν δὲ ἐκεῖ ἀγέλη χοίρων ἱκανῶν βοσκομένη ἐν τῷ ὄρει, καὶ παρεκάλεσαν αὐτὸν ἵνα ἐπιτρέψῃ αὐτοῖς εἰς ἐκείνους εἰσελθεῖν, καὶ ἐπέτρεψεν αὐτοῖς.

33. Ἐξεληθόντα δὲ τὰ δαιμόνια ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, εἰσῆλθον εἰς τοὺς χοίρους, καὶ ὥρμησεν ἡ ἀγέλη κατὰ τοῦ κρημνοῦ εἰς τὴν λίμνην καὶ ἀπεπνίγη.

34. Ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ βόσκοντες τὸ γεγονός, ἔφυγον, καὶ ἀπήγγειλαν εἰς τὴν πόλιν καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἀγρούς.

35. Ἐξεῆλθον δὲ ἰδεῖν τὸ γεγονός, καὶ ἦλθαν πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν, καὶ εὗρον καθήμενον τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἄφ' οὗ τὰ δαιμόνια ἐξεῆλθεν, ἱματισμένον καὶ σωφρονοῦντα, παρὰ τοὺς πόδας Ἰησοῦ, καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν.

36. Ἀπήγγειλαν δὲ αὐτοῖς οἱ ἰδόντες, πῶς ἐσώθῃ ὁ δαιμονισθεὶς.

37. Καὶ ἠρώτησεν αὐτὸν ἅπαν τὸ πλῆθος τῆς περιχώρου τῶν Γερασηνῶν ἀπελθεῖν ἀπ' αὐτῶν, ὅτι φόβῳ μεγάλῳ συνέιχοντο, αὐτὸς δὲ ἐμβὰς εἰς τὸ πλοῖον, ὑπέστρεψεν.

38. Ἐδεῖτο δὲ αὐτοῦ ὁ ἀνὴρ ἄφ' οὗ ἐξεληλύθει τὰ δαιμόνια, εἶναι σὺν αὐτῷ: ἀπέλυσεν δὲ αὐτὸν λέγων:

39. Return to thy house, and declare how great things God hath done for thee. And he went his way, publishing throughout the whole city how great things Jesus had done for him.

39. Ὑπόστρεφε εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου, καὶ διηγοῦ ὅσα σοὶ ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεός, καὶ ἀπῆλθεν καθ' ὅλην τὴν πόλιν κηρύσσων ὅσα ἐποίησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς.

In the twenty-eighth verse of the text of Matthew we find the reading *Γεργασηνῶν* in many uncial codices. Such reading is also followed by the Coptic, Gothic, Armenian and Ethiopian versions. Some authorities have *Γεργεσαιῶν*, and some *Γερασηνῶν*. In Verse twenty-nine *Ἰησοῦ* is added in C³, E, K, M, S, U, V, X, Δ, Π, et al. The same authorities, with C instead of C³, have *ἐπίτρεψον ἡμῖν ἀπελθεῖν* in the thirty-first verse, and *εἰς τὴν ἀγέλην τῶν χοίρων* in the thirty-second verse.

In the first verse of the text of Mark we find the reading *Γερασηνῶν* in ℵ*, B, and D. This is adopted by the Vulgate, and it is approved by Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort. In A, C, and Π we read *Γαδαρηνῶν*, which is adopted by the Syriac and Gothic versions. *Γεργασηνῶν* appears in L, U, and Δ, and is adopted by the Coptic, Armenian, and Ethiopian versions. Theophylactus declares that this last reading is found in the best codices. *Εὐθύς* appears before *ὑπήντησεν* in ℵ, A, C, D, L, Δ, Π, et al. In Verse three *ἀλύσει* appears in B, C*, L, and 33. It is approved by Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort. *Ἀλύσεσιν* is found in ℵ, A, C², D, Δ, Π, et al. It is adopted by the Vulgate, Coptic, Syriac, Armenian, Ethiopian and Gothic versions. In the same verse A, C², Δ, Π, et al, omit *οὐκέτι*. It is retained by ℵ, B, C*, D, L and Δ. In the tenth verse *αὐτά* is found in B, C and Δ; most of the other authorities have *αὐτούς*. In this verse also the plural *παρεκάλουν* is found in A and Δ. *Πάντες οἱ δαίμονες* follows *παρεκάλεσαν* in the twelfth verse in A, E, F, G, H, S, U, V, et al. K and M, insert *δαίμονες* alone. In Verse thirteen A, Π, et al. add *εὐθέως*.

In Verse twenty-six of the text of Luke, we find the reading *Γερασηνῶν* in B and D. It is adopted by the Vulgate. *Γεργασηνῶν* appears in ℵ, L, X, and Z. This is adopted by

the Coptic, Armenian, Ethiopian, and Jerusalem Syriac versions. Γαδαρηνῶν is the reading of A, K, Γ, Δ, Λ, Π, et al. This is adopted by the Peshitto, the Curetonian Syriac, the palimpsest Sinaitic Syriac, and the Gothic. In Verse twenty-seven ἔχων is found in **Σ**, B, and 157; the others have *ὅς εἶχεν*. In the same verse χρόνῳ ἱκανῶ is the reading of **Σ**, B, L, and Z. It is endorsed by Tischendorf, Westcott, and Hort. It is also followed by the Armenian, Ethiopian, and Jerusalem Syriac. The other authorities have *ἐκ χρόνων ἱκανῶν*. In verse thirty-two βοσκομένη is found in **Σ**, B, D, K, U, Π, et al. This is followed by the Peshitto, the Jerusalem Syriac, and by the Armenian and the Ethiopian versions. Tischendorf approves the reading *βοσκομένων*. The other variants are unimportant.

There is a great discrepancy among all the authorities concerning the name of the site of this event. The Vulgate uniformly follows the reading Γερασηνῶν in all the texts of all three Evangelists. There is no doubt that the event happened on the eastern shore of the Sea of Gennesaret. According to Josephus, Gadara was a thriving metropolis of Peræa, distant from Tiberias sixty stadia, about seven miles. There are extensive ruins now on the eastern side of the lake, which the traditions of the country term the ruins of Gadara. Farther eastward is the city of Djerash, the ancient Gerasa. Now the site of this event is not said to be in any city or near any city of either of these names. The Gospel account does not designate the name of the city. It says that it happened in the region of a tribe of men, and this tribe is called the Gadarenes by some authorities; Gergesenes by others; Gerasenes by others. It is, of course, probable that the tribal name was derived from their chief city; but this city may have been distant many miles. The gens had spread over the territory down to the shore of the lake, and swineherds of this tribe were tending herds of swine on the precipitous banks of the lake. We can not determine which is the true reading. It is a mere accidental detail, and names have changed much since that date. Names of villages have disappeared from the memory of man, and great uncertainty attends the determination of the site of many important events in the sacred records.

We encounter another difficulty in the fact that Matthew declares that there were two demoniacs; whereas Mark and Luke speak of only one. The best solution of this difficulty is to suppose that there were in reality two demoniacs, but one of them was the chief; he acted as the spokesman; he was the more famous for the acts described by Mark and Luke. Demoniac possession did not always manifest itself in the same way. Mary Magdalene had seven demons, and yet the account does not imply that she committed any acts of violence. Hence we believe that one of these men was famous through all the region on that side of the lake for his fierce acts of violence. Mark and Luke speak only of this one. Whether the other one was associated with that famous one or not is uncertain. We may here, with SS. Mark and Luke fix our attention on this terrible being. This man seems to have been permanently deranged by the demons within him. The demons gave him a superhuman strength so that no bands or chains could hold him. Many times those of his house had tried to bind him securely hand and foot to prevent him from injuring himself or others, but when the fury of the demons agitated him, he would break all chains, and tearing off his clothes, he would rush out into desert places; and his usual habitation was in the tombs. We have before stated in this work that the tombs in the East often consisted either of natural caves or excavations in the side of hills often consisting of several large chambers. Of course, there were smaller openings used for burial, but many of the tombs have several chambers, sometimes various stories. Now some of these larger tombs served as the habitation of this terrible man.

Even at present some tombs in Syria are inhabited by men. All connected with the demoniac betokens the character of the spirits within him. His violence, his choice of habitation, and his hatred of his fellow man are all diabolical. In his wild rage he would often cut himself with stones, and emit wild, dreadful cries.

And when he saw Jesus from afar off he ran to him, and fell down before him, and cried with a loud voice: "What is to me and to thee, Jesus, thou Son of the Most High God? I adjure thee by God, torment me not." It is evident here that

it is not the man that is speaking, but the spokesman of the evil spirits within him. The words are in every way remarkable. The devil recognizes the power of Jesus, and he begins to beg earnestly for mercy. It is a clear confession of the Divinity of Jesus from the infernal world. The high intelligence of the devil recognizes clearly the nature and the power of the being who stood before him. Before that awful power the demon cringes, and begs with mingled accents of hate, fear and despair.

The kingdom of Satan is almost as mysterious as the kingdom of Heaven. Under certain circumstances the testimony of Satan would have no proving force. He is the father of lies. But the present testimony carries conviction. It is an unwilling acknowledgment wrung from the fiend by the absolute power of the Son of God. The action of the fiend in the present account is aimed to obtain some leniency in Jesus' treatment of him. It is remarkable that the devil asks in the name of God that Jesus torment him not. It is because the demon is filled with terror that he employs the holy name of God to beseech mercy from Jesus.

Matthew adds that the demons ask Jesus if he had come before the time to torment them.

The demons know that they are reserved for judgment. They know that their time of operating on earth will cease. They do not express a belief that this time had then come, but they imply by the question that Jesus should let them alone until that time.

Jesus now addresses the evil spirit, and asks him what is his name. The answer is remarkable: "My name is Legion; for we are many." The name legion is a term to signify an indefinitely large number. The devil who speaks represents himself as a leader of a host of evil spirits who were actually in possession of the man. The devils are not designated in their world by personal names as men are. The Lord's motive in asking this question was a deep one. He did not wish to know the devil's particular designation, as that spirit is not named as men are named. But Jesus wished to compel the principal of the evil spirits to manifest their number. There are several

cases recorded in Holy Scriptures where many demons possessed one person; but this is the only case where such a large number is affirmed to have been in possession of one human being.

The number of the evil spirits heighten the miracle. It shows that Jesus by one word was able to subdue a whole legion of devils. The devil speaks suppliantly, because the mighty power of Jesus forced the evil spirit to make proper answer to his words. All things co-operate to the glory of God; and the demons in the grasp of the mighty power of Jesus promoted the great designs of the Incarnation.

The demons now earnestly plead that Jesus send them not out of the country. This is also mysterious. Luke records that the devils plead that they be not sent into the abyss; and by the abyss it is clear that they mean hell. No man can tell the nature of the devil's life. It is however generally believed that the evil spirit enjoys no mitigation of his suffering, while he operates among men on earth. But Satan's desire to accomplish evil is so great that he desires to remain on earth to continue his operations.

The devil now in the name of his legion asks permission to enter into a herd of swine that are feeding near by. St. Mark tells us that the number of the herd was two thousand. The number seems large, when we consider that the hog was an unclean animal. But we must remember that the event happened among a Gentile people, of whose customs and modes of life we know nothing. It may have been that this large herd of swine was famous in the land. If a man made a specialty of raising swine, such a herd is readily conceivable. There is no evidence that the wild tribes living on that side of the lake considered the swine as the Jews did. At all events the statement stands in Mark, and there is no good cause to doubt it.

In asking to be permitted to enter into the swine, the devil reveals the foulness of his nature. Among all domestic animals, the hog has the lowest, coarsest instinct. And yet the fiend is eager to take residence in this lowest of the brutes. Some have held that Satan's object in asking to be allowed to enter into the swine was to injure the owners of the herd by the destruction of the animals. This seems very improbable. Had

the devil's motive been such, Jesus would never have consented to allow its accomplishment. It seems more probable therefore that Satan truly begged for a residence in these animals. To understand the devil's object in asking this request, we should need to know more of the devil's nature than we do. It is a deep, dark mystery; but his mode of being must be such that it would have been some benefit for him to have occupied the bodies of the hogs as his residence on earth.

We cannot hold with those who believe that Satan himself drove the herd into the sea. His nefarious designs recoil on his own head, when he is opposed by divine power. The devil had hoped to be allowed to dwell in the bodies of the hogs, but as soon as the legion of evil spirits entered into the animals, the frightened herd ran headlong into the lake. This action of the hogs had not been foreseen by Satan, and he could not stop it. He has no absolute power over nature, and especially was his power curtailed here by the direct action of Jesus in the event.

It is in vain to charge here that Jesus was accessory in the destruction of the herd of swine. God is absolute owner of all things, and can in virtue of his absolute supreme dominion make any disposition that he wishes of any creature. And moreover, in manifold ways God could recompense the owners of the hogs for the loss of their property.

The infinite wisdom of the Son of God is reflected in the whole event. By that supreme wisdom the design of Satan is made to promote the ends of salvation. Had Jesus quietly healed a demoniac in that region, the knowledge of it would have spread slowly, and men would soon have forgotten it. But the destruction of the herd of swine was such a concrete proof of the prevalence of Jesus' power over numbers of evil spirits that the fame spread abroad through the land, and forced men to give thought to the character of the great Prophet who had arisen in Galilee.

Of course, the drowning of the herd in the lake affected the devils only in depriving them of a particular kind of habitation.

We can easily imagine the terror of the swineherds. The whole herd most probably was made up of several smaller herds

belonging to different individuals. The region seems to have been a sort of common pasture land for swine. Consequently several swineherds would be there in the region to look after the several individual herds. These poor men fled in terror from the scene, and told in the city the marvelous event. And soon a vast concourse of people are assembled on the site of the event: they see the man from whom the devils had been driven, sitting clothed and in his right mind, at Jesus' feet. To those who came out from the city many witnesses testified of the expulsion of the demons, and the marvelous destruction of the herd of swine. A great fear seized upon the people. They recognized that there was in their land a being of mighty power, superior to the power of the legion of demons. The natural effect of such realization upon such rude minds was a feeling of terror.

When David of old saw the great effects wrought by the Ark, he feared to bring it into his house, but carried it aside into the house of Obededom the Gittite. So it was with the rude people in whose borders the miracle was wrought. They thought not of the divine character of the Son of God, but only of his absolute power. If they angered such a powerful being, he could destroy them all. Hence they unite in a petition that Jesus should leave their country. And Jesus grants their petition. He had manifested his power, and sowed the seed of his teaching. It was not expected to produce immediate effects. It was to be recorded as a credential for future times for the benefit not alone of the men of that region, but of the whole world.

It is evident that Jesus had gone over the lake for the sole express purpose of working the miracle. He now summons his disciples, and prepares to go back to Capharnaum. As they are about to enter the boat, the man who had been possessed by the demons asks of Jesus to be allowed to accompany him. But Jesus refuses. The Lord perfectly understood the soul of the man, his powers and his traits. With a perfect comprehension of the whole issue, he sees that the man is not apt for the peculiar life of a disciple. Wherefore, the Lord points out how the man can serve him by remaining in his own country. He is bidden go back to his people, and become a herald of the

great power of the Son of God throughout his own country. This he did, and it is reasonable to believe, when the redemption of the world was consummated, and Jesus had arisen from the dead, that this man came into the Church of Christ, and obtained salvation thereby.

In the disposition made of this man by Jesus we are taught that all men can serve God in some way, but that not all are called to the life of an apostle. God alone can tell of the proper dispositions which fit a man for that life; and there are those who become saints in other careers who would be dismal failures in the career of an apostle.

The mystery of the present event is intensified for the reason that Jesus therein deals with creatures of whose mode of being we know but little. From divine revelation and from certain data of history we know of the existence of devils. We know also that these wage an eternal war against mankind, and that they in various ways exercise their activity on earth. Beyond this all is hidden. We know nothing of the state of being of these creatures. We do not know the extent of their powers; nor do we know how they operate. We do not know the demons' relations to place; nor do we know how they are affected by other creatures. In the present miracle Christ clearly proved that he was omnipotent over the infernal world. There is no combat, no struggle. The demons recognize their Lord: they do not believe and love; but they believe and tremble. What moved the demons to desire to enter into the swine is also shrouded in mystery; but at all events Christ made use of this granted request to increase the evidential force of the miracle.

MATT. IX. 18—26.

MARK V. 21—43.

18. Ταῦτα αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος αὐτοῖς, ἰδοὺ ἄρχων εἰς προσελθὼν προσεκύνει αὐτῷ, λέγων: Ὅτι ἡ θυγάτηρ μου ἄρτι ἐτελεύτησεν,

21. Καὶ διαπεράσαντος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐν πλοίῳ πάλιν εἰς τὸ πέραν, συνήχθη ὄχλος πολὺς ἐπ' αὐτόν: καὶ ἦν παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν.

22. Καὶ ἔρχεται εἰς τῶν ἀρχισυναγῶγων, ὀνόματι Ἰάειρος, καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτὸν πίπτει πρὸς τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ.

ἀλλὰ ἐλθὼν ἐπίθες τὴν χεῖρά σου ἐπ' αὐτήν, καὶ ζήσεται.

19. Καὶ ἐγερθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἠκολούθησεν αὐτῷ, καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ.

20. Καὶ ἰδοὺ γυνὴ αἰμορροοῦσα δώδεκα ἔτη, προσελθοῦσα ὀπισθεν, ἥψατο τοῦ κρασπέδου τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ.

21. Ἐλεγεν γὰρ ἐν ἑαυτῇ, ἐὰν μόνον ἄψωμαι τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ σωθήσομαι.

22. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς στραφεὶς, καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτήν, εἶπεν· Θάρσει, θύγατερ, ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε, καὶ ἐσώθη ἡ γυνὴ ἀπὸ τῆς ὥρας ἐκείνης.

23. Καὶ παρεκάλει αὐτὸν πολλὰ, λέγων· Ὅτι τὸ θυγάτριόν μου ἐσχάτως ἔχει, ἵνα ἐλθὼν ἐπιθῇς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῇ, ἵνα σωθῇ καὶ ζήσῃ.

24. Καὶ ἀπῆλθεν μετ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἠκολούθει αὐτῷ ὄχλος πολλός, καὶ συνέθλιβον αὐτόν.

25. Καὶ γυνὴ οὖσα ἐν ρύσει αἵματος δώδεκα ἔτη,

26. Καὶ πολλὰ παθοῦσα ὑπὸ πολλῶν ἱατρῶν, καὶ δαπανήσασα τὰ παρ' αὐτῆς πάντα, καὶ μηδὲν ὠφεληθεῖσα, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον εἰς τὸ χεῖρον ἐλθοῦσα.

27. Ἀκούσασα τὰ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ἐλθοῦσα ἐν τῷ ὄχλῳ ὀπισθεν, ἥψατο τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ.

28. Ἐλεγεν γὰρ· Ὅτι ἐὰν ἄψωμαι κἀν τῶν ἱματίων αὐτοῦ, σωθήσομαι.

29. Καὶ εὐθὺς ἐξηράνθη ἡ πηγὴ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτῆς, καὶ ἔγνω· τῷ σώματι ὅτι ἴσται ἀπὸ τῆς μάστιγος.

30. Καὶ εὐθὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐπιγινούς ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὴν ἐξ αὐτοῦ δύναμιν ἐξελθοῦσαν, ἐπιστραφεὶς ἐν τῷ ὄχλῳ, ἔλεγεν· Τίς μου ἥψατο τῶν ἱματίων;

31. Καὶ ἔλεγον αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ· Βλέπεις τὸν ὄχλον συνθλίβοντά σε, καὶ λέγεις· Τίς μου ἥψατο;

32. Καὶ περιεβλέπετο ἰδεῖν τὴν τοῦτο ποιήσαν.

33. Ἡ δὲ γυνὴ φοβηθεῖσα καὶ τρέμουσα, εἰδυῖα δὲ γέγονεν αὐτῇ.

23. Καὶ ἐλθὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν τοῦ ἄρχοντος, καὶ ἰδὼν τοὺς αὐλητὰς καὶ τὸν ὄχλον θορυβούμενον, ἔλεγεν:

24. Ἀναχωρεῖτε, οὐ γὰρ ἀπέθανεν τὸ κοράσιον, ἀλλὰ καθεύδει, καὶ κατεγέλων αὐτοῦ.

25. Ὅτε δὲ ἐξεβλήθη ὁ ὄχλος, εἰσελθὼν ἐκράτησεν τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῆς, καὶ ἠγέρθη τὸ κοράσιον.

26. Καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἡ φήμη αὕτη εἰς ὅλην τὴν γῆν ἐκείνην.

ἦλθεν καὶ προσέπεσεν αὐτῷ, καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ πᾶσαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν.

34. Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῇ: Θύγατερ, ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε, ὑπάγε εἰς εἰρήνην, καὶ ἴσθι ὑγιὴς ἀπὸ τῆς μάστιγός σου.

35. Ἐπὶ αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος, ἔρχονται ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀρχισυναγώγου, λέγοντες, ὅτι ἡ θυγάτηρ σου ἀπέθανεν: τί ἔτι σκύλλεις τὸν διδάσκαλον;

36. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς παρακούσας τὸν λόγον τὸν λαλούμενον, λέγει τῷ ἀρχισυναγώγῳ: Μὴ φοβοῦ, μόνον πίστευε.

37. Καὶ οὐκ ἀφῆκεν οὐδένα μετ' αὐτοῦ συνακολουθῆσαι, εἰ μὴ τὸν Πέτρον, καὶ Ἰάκωβον, καὶ Ἰωάννην τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἰακώβου.

38. Καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ ἀρχισυναγώγου, καὶ θεωρεῖ θόρυβον, καὶ κλαίοντας καὶ ἀλαλάζοντας πολλὰ.

39. Καὶ εἰσελθὼν λέγει αὐτοῖς: Τί θορυβεῖσθε καὶ κλαίετε; τὸ παιδίον οὐκ ἀπέθανεν, ἀλλὰ καθεύδει.

40. Καὶ κατεγέλων αὐτοῦ. Αὐτὸς δὲ ἐκβαλὼν πάντας, παραλαμβάνει τὸν πατέρα τοῦ παιδίου, καὶ τὴν μητέρα, καὶ τοὺς μετ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ εἰσπορεύεται ὅπου ἦν τὸ παιδίον.

41. Καὶ κρατήσας τῆς χειρὸς τοῦ παιδίου, λέγει αὐτῇ: Ταλειθὰ κοῦμ, ὃ ἐστίν μεθερμηνεύμενον: Τὸ κοράσιον, σοὶ λέγω, ἔγειρε.

42. Καὶ εὐθὺς ἀνέστη τὸ κοράσιον, καὶ περιεπάτει, ἦν γὰρ ἐτῶν δώδεκα, καὶ ἐξέστησαν εὐθὺς ἐκστάσει μεγάλη.

43. Καὶ διεστείλατο αὐτοῖς πολλὰ, ἵνα μηδεὶς γινῶι τοῦτο, καὶ εἶπεν δοθῆναι αὐτῇ φαγεῖν.

18. While he spoke these things unto them, behold, there came a ruler, and worshipped him, saying: My daughter is even now dead: but come and lay thy hand upon her, and she shall live.

19. And Jesus arose, and followed him, and so did his disciples.

20. And behold, a woman, who had an issue of blood twelve years, came behind him, and touched the border of his garment: for she said within herself:

21. If I do but touch his garment, I shall be made whole.

21. And when Jesus had crossed over again in the boat unto the other side, a great multitude was gathered unto him: and he was by the sea.

22. And there cometh one of the rulers of the synagogue, Jairus by name; and seeing him, he falleth at his feet,

23. And beseecheth him much, saying: My little daughter is at the point of death: I pray thee that thou come and lay thy hands on her, that she may be made whole, and live.

24. And he went with him; and a great multitude followed him, and they thronged him.

25. And a woman, who had an issue of blood twelve years,

26. And had suffered many things of many physicians, and had spent all that she had, and was nothing bettered, but rather grew worse,

27. Having heard the things concerning Jesus, came in the crowd behind, and touched his garment.

28. For she said: If I touch but his garments, I shall be made whole.

29. And straightway the flowing of her blood was dried up; and she felt in her body that she was healed of her plague.

30. And straightway Jesus, perceiving in himself that the power proceeding from him

22. But Jesus turning and seeing her said: Daughter, be of good cheer; thy faith hath made thee whole. And the woman was made whole from that hour.

23. And when Jesus came into the ruler's house, and saw the flute-players, and the crowd making a tumult, he said:

24. Give place: for the damsel is not dead, but sleep-

had gone forth, turned him about in the crowd, and said: Who touched my garments?

31. And his disciples said unto him: Thou seest the multitude thronging thee, and sayest thou: Who touched me?

32. And he looked round about to see her that had done this thing.

33. But the woman fearing and trembling, knowing what had been done to her, came and fell down before him, and told him all the truth.

34. And he said unto her: Daughter, thy faith hath made thee whole; go in peace, and be whole of thy plague.

35. While he yet spoke, they come from the ruler of the synagogue's house, saying: Thy daughter is dead: why troublest thou the Master any further?

36. But Jesus, not heeding the word spoken, saith unto the ruler of the synagogue: Fear not, only believe.

37. And he suffered no man to follow him, save Peter, and James, and John the brother of James.

38. And they came to the house of the ruler of the synagogue; and he beholdeth a tumult, and many weeping and wailing greatly.

39. And when he was entered in, he saith unto them:

eth. And they laughed him to scorn.

25. But when the crowd was put forth, he entered in, and took her by the hand, and the damsel arose.

26. And the fame thereof went forth into all the land.

Why make ye a tumult, and weep? the child is not dead, but sleepeth.

40. And they laughed him to scorn. But he, having put them all forth, taketh the father of the child and her mother and them that were with him, and goeth in where the child was.

41. And taking the child by the hand, he saith unto her: Talitha cumi; which is, being interpreted, Damsel, I say unto thee, Arise.

42. And straightway the damsel rose up, and walked; for she was twelve years old. And they were amazed straightway with a great amazement.

43. And he charged them much that no man should know this: and he commanded that something should be given her to eat.

LUKE VIII. 40—56.

40. And as Jesus returned, the multitude welcomed him; for they were all waiting for him.

41. And behold, there came a man named Jairus, and he was a ruler of the synagogue: and he fell down at Jesus' feet, and besought him to come into his house;

42. For he had an only daughter, about twelve years of age, and she lay a dying. But as he went the multitudes thronged him.

40. Ἐν δὲ τῷ ὑποστρέφειν τὸν Ἰησοῦν, ἀπεδέξατο αὐτὸν ὁ ὄχλος, ἦσαν γὰρ πάντες προσδοκῶντες αὐτόν.

41. Καὶ ἰδοὺ, ἦλθεν ἀνὴρ, ὃ ὄνομα Ἰάειρος, καὶ οὗτος ἄρχων τῆς συναγωγῆς ὑπῆρχεν, καὶ πεσὼν παρὰ τοὺς πόδας Ἰησοῦ παρεκάλει αὐτὸν εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ.

42. Ὅτι θυγάτηρ μονογενῆς ἦν αὐτῷ ὡς ἑτῶν δώδεκα, καὶ αὕτη ἀπέθνησκεν. Ἐν δὲ τῷ ὑπάγειν αὐτὸν οἱ ὄχλοι συνέπνιγον αὐτόν.

43. And a woman having an issue of blood twelve years, who had spent all her living upon physicians, and could not be healed of any,

44. Came behind him, and touched the border of his garment: and immediately the issue of her blood stanch'd.

45. And Jesus said: Who is it that touch'd me? And when all denied, Peter said, and they that were with him: Master, the multitudes press thee and crush thee.

46. But Jesus said: Some one did touch me: for I perceived that power had gone forth from me.

47. And when the woman saw that she was not hid, she came trembling, and falling down before him declared in the presence of all the people for what cause she touch'd him, and how she was healed immediately.

48. And he said unto her: Daughter, thy faith hath made thee whole; go in peace.

49. While he yet spoke, there cometh one from the ruler of the synagogue's house, saying: Thy daughter is dead; trouble not the Master.

50. But Jesus hearing it, answered him: Fear not, only believe, and she shall be made whole.

51. And when he came to the house, he suffer'd not any man to enter in with him, save

43. Καὶ γυνὴ οὖσα ἐν ῥύσει αἵματος ἀπὸ ἐτῶν δώδεκα, ἥτις οὐκ ἴσχυσεν ὑπ' οὐδενὸς θεραπευθῆναι προσελθοῦσα ὀπισθεν,

44. Ἐφάτο τοῦ κρασπέδου τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ, καὶ παραχρῆμα ἔστη ἡ ῥύσις τοῦ αἵματος αὐτῆς.

45. Καὶ εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς: Τίς ὁ ἀψάμενός μου; ἀρνούμενων δὲ πάντων, εἶπεν ὁ Πέτρος;: Ἐπιστάτα, οἱ ὄχλοι συνέχουσίν σε καὶ ἀποθλίβουσιν.

46. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν: Ἐφάτό μου τίς, ἐγὼ γὰρ ἔγνων δύναμιν ἐξεληλυθυῖαν ἀπ' ἐμοῦ.

47. Ἰδοῦσα δὲ ἡ γυνὴ ὅτι οὐκ ἔλαθεν, τρέμουσα ἦλθεν, καὶ προσπεσοῦσα αὐτῷ, δι' ἣν αἰτίαν ἤφατο αὐτοῦ, ἀπήγγειλεν ἐνώπιον παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ, καὶ ὡς ἰάθη παραχρῆμα.

48. Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῇ: Θύγατερ, ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε: πορεύου εἰς εἰρήνην.

49. Ἐτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος, ἔρχεται τις παρὰ τοῦ ἀρχισυναγώγου λέγων ὅτι τέθνηκεν ἡ θυγάτηρ σου: μηκέτι σκύλλε τὸν διδάσκαλον.

50. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἀκούσας, ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ: Μὴ φοβοῦ, μόνονπίστευσον καὶ σωθήσεται.

51. Ἐλθὼν δὲ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, οὐκ ἄφῃκεν εἰσελθεῖν τινὰ σὺν αὐτῷ, εἰ μὴ Πέτρον καὶ Ἰωάννην καὶ Ἰά-

Peter, and John, and James, and the father of the maiden and her mother.

52. And all were weeping, and bewailing her: but he said: Weep not, for she is not dead, but sleepeth.

53. And they laughed him to scorn, knowing that she was dead.

54. But he, taking her by the hand, called, saying: Maiden, arise.

55. And her spirit returned, and she rose up immediately: and he commanded that something be given her to eat.

56. And her parents were amazed: but he charged them to tell no man what had been done.

κωδον, καὶ τὸν πατέρα τῆς παιδὸς, καὶ τὴν μητέρα.

52. Ἐκλαιον δὲ πάντες, καὶ ἐκόπτοντο αὐτήν: ὁ δὲ εἶπεν: Μὴ κλαίετε, οὐ γὰρ ἀπέθανεν, ἀλλὰ καθεύδει.

53. Καὶ κατεγέλων αὐτοῦ, εἰδότες ὅτι ἀπέθανεν.

54. Αὐτὸς δὲ κρατήσας τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῆς, ἐφώνησεν, λέγων: Ἡ παῖς, ἔγειρε.

55. Καὶ ἐπέστρεψεν τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτῆς, καὶ ἀνέστη παραχρῆμα, καὶ διέταξεν αὐτῇ δοθῆναι φαγεῖν.

56. Καὶ ἐξέστησαν οἱ γονεῖς αὐτῆς: ὁ δὲ παρήγγειλεν αὐτοῖς μηδενὶ εἰπεῖν τὸ γεγονός.

In the eighteenth verse of Matthew **Σ** and B have εἰς προσελθών: others have εἰσελθών, or εἰς ἐλθών, others τὶς προσελθών.

In verse twenty-two of Mark the reading καὶ ἰδοὺ ἔρχεται occurs in A, C, Π, et al. In the twenty-third verse παρακάλει is found in A, **Σ**, C and L. It is approved by Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort. The other authorities support παρεκάλει. In the twenty-seventh verse τὰ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ is the reading of **Σ***, B, C* and Δ. This reading is favored by Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort. **Σ**°, A, C², D, L, and Π omit the τά. At the end of Verse forty, A, C, Π, et al., add ἀνακείμενον. Many of the versions follow this reading. In Verse forty-one κούμ occurs in **Σ**, B, C, L and M. A, D, Δ, Π, et al., have κούμι. The second reading is a transliteration of the feminine imperative of **קִיּוּ**. Those who defend the reading κούμ believe that the last yod was not pronounced in the Aramaic tongue.

The fortieth verse of the text of Luke is introduced by ἐν δὲ τῷ in B, L and R; the others have ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ.

There is found in many authorities at the end of Verse forty-five the clause *καὶ λέγεις, τίς ὁ ἀψάμενός μου*. It is omitted by **Σ**, B, L, 1, 22, 131, and 157. It is considered spurious by Tischendorf, Westcott, and Hort, and is omitted from the Bohairic, Sahidic, and Armenian versions. In Verse forty-eight *θάρσει* is omitted by **Σ**, B, D, L, and Z. It is rejected by Tischendorf, Westcott, and Hort, and by the Vulgate, Bohairic, Sahidic, and Syriac versions. In verse forty-nine, **Σ**, B, and D have *μηκέτι*. This is approved by Tischendorf, Westcott, and Hort. The others have *μή*. In the fiftieth verse *πίστευσον* has the authority of B, L, Z, Tischendorf, Westcott, and Hort. The others have *πίστευε*. In the fifty-fourth verse Tischendorf approves the reading *ἐγείρου*. **Σ**, B, C, D, X, 1, 33, Westcott and Hort, support *ἔγειρε*. In the beginning of this verse we also find the clause, *αὐτὸς δὲ ἐκβαλὼν ἔξω πάντα*, in A, K, R, S, U, II, et al. This reading is approved by the Gothic and Syriac versions.

It is evident from the reading of these parallel passages that Matthew is intent upon narrating only the substance of the events, whereas Mark and Luke in the present case describe many details. The compendious character of Matthew's narration has given rise to a difficulty. From Mark and Luke we learn that when the chief of the synagogue came to Jesus, to implore him to save his child, the child was not yet dead, but at the point of death. And yet Matthew says that the aforesaid chief asked Jesus to raise his daughter who was even now dead. We shall be aided to an understanding of the event by outlining an order of the various elements in the accounts which shall include the substantial facts mentioned by all three Evangelists, and then bring every Evangelist into accord with the substantial account.

The multitudes had known of Jesus' journey across the lake; they waited eagerly for his return, and received him with great expressions of joy. And as he was surrounded by the people, a prominent Jew of Capharnaum, Jairus by name, a chief of the synagogue, made his way through the multitude, and falling down at Jesus' feet he asked him for the life of his only daughter a child of twelve. The Evangelists only give a compendious account of Jairus' petition. It is evident that

in the act of dying the girl had passed beyond any human help before her father left her to come to Jesus. Jairus knew that in the course of nature his child must die at once. In fact, she died before Jairus returned with Jesus. Now all that Jairus said to Jesus in his petition is not recorded. He evidently declared that the girl was still alive, though at the point of death when he left her. This Mark and Luke have recorded. But in describing the gravity of his daughter's illness Jairus may have declared that he feared that the child was even then dead, and may have asked Jesus to raise her from the dead. When men came out to tell Jairus that his daughter was dead, he may have reiterated his petition in the sense that Jesus should raise the child from the dead. All things considered the prayer of Jairus was a petition that Jesus should raise to life one dead. The act of Jesus was a raising of one from the dead. Hence Matthew condenses the narrative into what it substantially was. It is another evidence that a mechanical theory of verbal inspiration is untenable. The Evangelists agree in the substance of all narratives, but they record them as they remembered them, in their own words and style. Matthew in his study of brevity omits many details, and makes of Jairus' petition that which in effect it was, a prayer for the raising of the dead.

Jairus prays that Jesus should come and lay his hand on his daughter. The hand is the ordinary instrument in external actions; and hence in cures, which are effected by physical contact, the hand is rightly conceived as the instrument.

Mark calls Jairus *one of the rulers* of the synagogue. To explain this expression of St. Mark, some have supposed that there was a sort of order of men who had the direction of affairs in the synagogue, and that Jairus was one of these. Others believe that there was more than one synagogue in Capharnaum. It seems more probable that Jairus was the only ruler of the only synagogue in Capharnaum; but that he is described by St. Mark as belonging to a class, for the reason that he belonged to the class of rulers who were in all the synagogues of Judæa. It is as though one should designate the only Catholic priest in a village as *one of the Roman Catholic priests*.

Jairus belonged to the upper class of the people. The Evangelists are careful to record his social status, not to create the impression that Christ discriminated in favor of the upper classes but to show that the event was a refutation of the calumny of the Pharisees. In John, VII. 48, these Pharisees boast that none of the rulers had believed in Christ. This was a specious argument to deceive the poor simple people. By this present event that calumny is effectually refuted.

Jairus has not the faith of the Centurion. He believes in some degree, but he earnestly begs that Jesus should go with him into his house. There is only one found in the whole Gospel who has the faith to say : "Lord, I am unworthy that thou shouldst enter under my roof; say only the word, and my servant shall be healed." But the Lord Jesus is merciful and indulgent; he prepares to go forthwith in response to the man's prayer. As Jesus and his disciples move forward towards the house of Jairus, a great multitude accompany them. The people had heard Jairus' prayer, and the expectation that some unusual event is to take place draws a vast concourse about Jesus. They press close to him on all sides, and their number continually increases as they go forward.

And now a marvellous event takes place. In that concourse of people there was a woman afflicted with a malignant disease of twelve years' duration. The woman had spent all her means upon physicians, and yet she only suffered by their treatment, and continually grew worse. The peculiar nature of the malady withheld the woman from addressing an open petition for relief to Jesus. Womanly modesty compelled her to conceal her ailment. She therefore says within herself: I will approach without observation, and touch the hem of his garments. It was great faith. Of such nature is the faith of Catholics who venerate Christ's cross, or the relics of his raiment, or even the relics of the saints.

The woman makes her way unobserved through the crowd, and lightly touches the border of Jesus' garment; and then followed a wonderful effect. She feels a new vigor resident in her diseased members. The hemorrhage is stanchd, and

the woman experiences again the joyous sensation of perfect health. She stands still in amazement, endeavoring to realize the great benefit that has been done to her.

But Jesus has stopped and has turned about, and is looking questioningly upon the multitude. "Who touched my garments?" asks Jesus in gentle accents. The disciples are amazed. What could the Master mean? Finally Peter, the usual spokesman, answers: "Thou seest the multitude thronging thee, and sayest thou: Who touched me?" The Apostles could not understand that, while many persons in the crowd were continually touching Jesus, and pressing upon him, he should demand to know what particular person had touched him. It was not the first time that they had failed to comprehend the deep significance of Jesus' words. But Jesus still fixes his questioning glance upon the multitude, and declares: "Some one did touch me; for I perceived that power had gone forth from me."

Perceiving now that her action was discovered, the woman comes forward, and acknowledges that she had touched him. The woman trembles with fear, and falls at his feet in a suppliant attitude. The motive of her fear was not a well defined logical reason but a vague indefinite apprehension. Her cure attests the awful power of Jesus. His action had caused a commotion in the crowd; and she knew that she was the one whom he was seeking. But her fear was of short duration. Her action proceeded from faith, and was in every way good, and Jesus would not allow the woman to suffer in consequence of an act of virtue. After falling down at Jesus' feet, the woman, in the presence of all the people confessed all; the nature of her illness, her touching of Jesus' garments, and her cure. And Jesus said: "Daughter, thy faith hath made thee whole; go in peace and be whole of thy plague." The Lord does not say: "My power hath made thee whole," which was the truth. The power that really operated the effect was the power of Jesus; but the faith of the woman is asserted as the cause of the effect, inasmuch as it moved Jesus to act. His divine power is an infinite resource, and faith applies it to mortals.

Had the woman been healed of her infirmity secretly, as she had wished, the proving force of the miracle would have been greatly lessened. She might tell the marvelous fact to others, but it could never have been so valuable to the world as it now is. For that reason, Jesus brought it about that the whole affair should be made public. He knew who it was that touched him, for he knew all things; but the public acknowledgment of the woman was necessary that the multitudes might recognize the power of the Son of God.

When men work any effect which is outside of the ordinary course of nature, they do it by virtue of a power extrinsic to themselves. They are only the instruments by which the higher power acts. But Jesus worked this and all other works by a power resident within him, a power that was his own in virtue of his equality with his Father. Therefore does he say that a power had gone out of him. He perceived that at the touch of his sacred garments, his divine person by physical causality wrought the cure of the woman.

Some institute a question to ascertain why it is that Matthew and Luke declare that the woman touched the *hem* of Jesus' garment, while Mark speaks only of the garment in general. Some think that the woman believed that there was a special healing efficacy in the hem of the garment more than in its other portions. This seems overdrawn. To touch the hem of one's garment is a slighter touch than to touch the other portions. The woman's faith was so great that she believed that the *least* touch of Jesus' garments would heal her. Again, one can touch the hem of a loose flowing tunic without attracting the wearer's attention. This the woman intended to do. Matthew and Luke mention this detail, but Mark omits it, since he judged that, inasmuch as the woman touched the hem, she touched the garment of the Lord.

The event forcibly teaches a lesson of faith. We may say within ourselves that we have no malady, and therefore have no need to plead for healing. In this we deceive ourselves. We may not have any great bodily ill, but how is it with our souls? How often the soul is sick unto death, and we never think of it, or care for it? It is because its proper life belongs to the unseen world, and this is rarely the subject of human

thought or exertion. The earth is thronged with myriads who are far more affected in soul than this woman was in body, and Jesus is ready to heal, and yet men will not have faith in him, or ask him for aught.

At this juncture a messenger arrives from the house of Jairus announcing that the daughter of Jairus was dead, and that there was no need to trouble the Master further. The death of the girl was intended as a private communication to Jairus, but Jesus overheard the message, and turning to the grief stricken father he exhorts him to have faith and fear not. It was a fearful test of faith. It is not so difficult to believe that a man may afford some help to one who yet lives, but in the presence of the awful power of death, it requires strong faith to still believe that life may again animate the cold, rigid form.

St. Luke records that Jesus also at this juncture promised the father, that, if he would persevere in believing, his daughter should be saved. Hence from that moment Jesus was pledged to save her.

It was customary in the East that, even at the death of the poorest persons, two flute-players and one hired mourner should be employed. Now as Jairus was a person of considerable importance, it is natural to suppose that many flute-players and hired mourners were employed. With these were the immediate kinsfolk and the friends and neighbors; and all were making vehement demonstrations of sorrow. As Jesus enters the house, he says to all: "Why make ye a tumult and weep? Give place; for the damsel is not dead but sleepeth." And they laughed him to scorn; for they knew that the girl was dead. This detail is added to increase the evidential force of the miracle. Naturally speaking the assembly was right in laughing at any one who should say that the girl was not dead. They all have conclusive evidence that the girl is dead. Jesus now sends out of the house the crowd, and then taking with him the parents of the child, and Peter, John and James, he enters the room where the dead child was lying.

Various causes have been assigned to explain why Jesus expelled the crowd before performing the miracle. Some have

believed that they were unworthy to witness such a sublime work of God; others think that the Lord simply tells them that their services were not needed, since the girl was not dead.

It seems more probable that the action of Jesus was too sacred to be performed in the midst of such a vulgar assemblage. It was an act of religion; and it was fitting that, as far as possible, the surroundings should be in keeping with such a sublime act. The father and mother had an inalienable right to be present; and Peter, John, and James are chosen as select witnesses of the event.

Jesus, the absolutely perfect model of human conduct, never displayed his power to gain the admiration of men. Men must know of his mighty works for the works were witnesses of his Messiahship, but Jesus brought it about that proper witnesses should bear witness of his works, while, at the same time, he shunned that popular recognition of which we are so covetous. This seems to be one of the motives why Jesus sent the crowd forth from the dead girl's room.

What particular reasons moved Jesus to select these three, we cannot fully know. Perhaps we have no right to know. Peter, of course, was there because he was the chief representative of the apostolic body; Jesus loved John in a special manner, and it was but natural that he should be intimately associated with Jesus in all the events of the divine life; and of James we can only say that the Lord Jesus, through his perfect comprehension of the characters of all whom he had chosen, found James most fitted to be associated with Peter and John as a witness of this miracle. The nature of the event demanded that only a small number should be in the room where the dead lay. The evidential force of the event would not be lessened thereby; for all could testify that the girl had died, and that she lived again; and those who were admitted to witness the event could tell how it was done.

Jesus now declares that the maid was not dead, but only slept. By this he did not wish to deny that she was dead. He did not wish to assert that her death in any way differed from ordinary deaths. He simply declared that the death of a human being, considered in its relation to him, as the Supreme Lord of life and death, is only a sleep. It is not the cessation

of being, but a change in the mode of being; a change over which Jesus has supreme authority. What he said of this dead girl, he could say of all the dead. Considered in relation to his almighty power, all the dead only sleep. As the daughter of Jairus arose at his command, so all the dead shall one day hear his voice, and come forth unto judgment.

There is no other power above the awful power of death save the power of God. When a good person dies, the words of Jesus can be applied to the event: "Such a one is not dead, but sleepeth."

Jesus approaches the form of the dead girl, and taking her lifeless hand, he addresses her as one would arouse a person from sleep: **מַלְיָתָא קוּמִי**, *maiden, arise*. **מַלְיָתָא** is the Aramaic feminine form of **מַלְיָא** which properly means a *youth*. **קוּמִי** is the feminine imperative form of **קוּם**, meaning to arise. At the bidding of Jesus, the girl's spirit returned to her, and she arose and walked. And Jesus commanded that something be given to the girl to eat. The walking and the eating attested the girl's restoration to perfect health.

The Lord straightway commanded the parents to tell no man of the wondrous event. The reasons that moved Christ to conceal the knowledge of this event were the same as we have explained in relation to preceding miracles. Christ shuns popularity. He would have the world come at a knowledge of his works only for its own salvation. As the perfect man and teacher of mankind, he teaches man to shun human praise. Moreover, the time for the world to know the works of Christ was after his resurrection. Then his chosen witnesses would publish the event for the instruction of all men. Christ therefore combined the two motives: he showed clearly that he did not wish his works to obtain any human praise or glory; and that he prudently kept back many of his works from the full knowledge of men till after the consummation of his mission. It was necessary that he should do many miracles, and it was necessary that a sufficient number of witnesses should see them; for these should be the means of moving men to believe in the new order of things; but at the same time, a

certain veil should hang over the divine life of Jesus until his life, death, and resurrection could be presented to men as a grand whole.

Of course, the first grand lesson of the event is to prove that Jesus is the Son of God. But we may draw another very useful lesson from the words of Jesus: "The maiden is not dead, but sleepeth." We all fear death; none of us fear a sleep. And by the power of Jesus death becomes a sleep. By his benign power, the greatest evil in the universe is converted into a peaceful sleep, with the certainty of awakening into a better life. But how bitter is the sleep that only awakes into the second death? If a man were convinced by sufficient evidence that at the end of a day he should sleep, and that the character of his life during that day should determine whether or not he should awake again on the following morning, how carefully he would order all the events of his life for that day? The principal thought in his mind would be: I must insure my awakening in the morning, and then I shall begin my proper life, which is without suffering and without end. And yet the longest human life compared to eternity is shorter than a day. And the character of our lives shall determine whether we shall awake and live with Christ for an eternity, or pass from the first death into the second death, which knows no end. And yet we squander this period of time which is given us to prepare for eternity. Men live with intensity the body's life, and the day wanes, and the sleep comes on; all things that they have lived for are worthless now; they have not insured their awakening. The sleep of death closes the scene, and man has lost an eternity of life for the sake of the enjoyment of a day of the world's false life.

What a sad sight to behold the worldling now in the evening of life, who has failed in his pursuit of temporal possessions! Men note him, and remark that his hair is fast growing gray. All the light and vigor have gone out of his life. His voice assumes a hollow tone. He is too old to begin over again. How bitterly he thinks over the lost opportunities, the mistakes in judgment, the selfish clash of others who were seeking the same goods. He gave his soul for this world, and he has failed. He looks forward to the few years yet left of his life,

and O, how sad is the thought! When he looks beyond the horizon of our mortal life he shudders, for he is a stranger to that world, and he has no basis of hope in that unseen world. Perhaps he summons all his remaining courage, and makes an effort to start again in life. He gives the few years that are left to a hard struggle, and then comes the end, the tragic end of a misspent life. The end of every worldling's life must be a dreadful failure, "What doth it profit a man to gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" And yet strange as it may seem, as the length of time in which mortals may use this world by age grows shorter, the tighter becomes their grip on things that in a short space of time will be of no more worth to them. Avarice is the vice of old age. If in a common field there were lying nuggets of gold and worthless cobblestones, and we saw a man pass the gold by and pick up and treasure the worthless stones, we should pity his folly. But they are legion who pass by the eternal treasures of the kingdom of Heaven for the base material goods of this earth which are worthless to man in the life for which he was created.

It seems at times that we could regret that God in his infinite wisdom has decreed not to give us a fuller knowledge of eternal life. All men love life, and yet many never think of eternal life, and never do anything for its possession. If we knew more of the nature of the life of the elect, it seems certain that we would bestow more thought and effort upon its acquisition. But God has willed that we should have only a dim partial revelation here, in order that we might prove our faith, and hold to his promises without further evidence. A man cannot have this faith and live the world's life. Worldly projects, conversation with men, and home interests all tend to lessen our grasp on the supernatural world. Often a life that is not wicked grows dull and cold, by the force of a narrow, monotonous environment. It is difficult to keep constantly in mind a realization of the grand estate for which we are created, when we are hemmed in by the commonplace, humdrum life of narrow surroundings. The ideas of those we meet are small and stale. There is nothing in our life to arouse the soul to any grand thought; we grow like our surroundings, torpid and insensible. Hence we have need to expend much thought to

rise above our surroundings; to develop our interior life; to withdraw our thoughts from the ordinary practicalities of life, and fix them on the unseen world.

MATT. IX. 27—34.

27. And as Jesus passed by from thence, two blind men followed him, crying out, and saying: Have mercy on us, thou Son of David.

28. And when he was come into the house, the blind men came to him; and Jesus saith unto them: Believe ye that I am able to do this? They say unto him: Yea, Lord.

29. Then touched he their eyes, saying: According to your faith be it done unto you.

30. And their eyes were opened. And Jesus strictly charged them, saying: See that no man know it.

31. But they went forth, and spread abroad his fame in all that land.

32. And as they went forth, behold, there was brought to him a dumb man possessed with a devil.

33. And when the devil was cast out, the dumb man spoke: and the multitudes marvelled, saying: It was never so seen in Israel.

34. But the Pharisees said: By the prince of the devils casteth he out devils.

27. Καὶ παράγοντι ἐκεῖθεν τῷ Ἰησοῦ, ἠκολούθησαν δύο τυφλοὶ, κράζοντες καὶ λέγοντες: Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, Υἱὸς Δαυίδ.

28. Ἐλθόντι δὲ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, προσῆλθαν αὐτῷ οἱ τυφλοὶ, καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς: Πιστεύετε ὅτι τοῦτο δύναμαι ποιῆσαι; Λέγουσιν αὐτῷ: Ναί, Κύριε.

29. Τότε ἥψατο τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν, λέγων: Κατὰ τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν γενηθήτω ὑμῖν.

30. Καὶ ἠνέωχθησαν αὐτῶν οἱ ὀφθαλμοί, καὶ ἐνεβριμήθη αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, λέγων: Ὁράτε, μηδεὶς γινωσκέτω.

31. Οἱ δὲ ἐξεληθόντες διεφύμισαν αὐτὸν ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ γῇ ἐκείνῃ.

32. Αὐτῶν δὲ ἐξερχομένων, ἰδοὺ προσήνεγκαν αὐτῷ κωφὸν δαιμονιζόμενον.

33. Καὶ ἐκβληθέντος τοῦ δαιμονίου, ἐλάλησεν ὁ κωφός, καὶ ἐθαύμασαν οἱ ὄχλοι, λέγοντες: Οὐδέποτε ἐφάνη οὕτως ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ.

34. Οἱ δὲ Φαρισαῖοι ἔλεγον: Ἐν τῷ ἄρχοντι τῶν δαιμονίων ἐκβάλλει τὰ δαιμόνια.

In Verse thirty many codices have *ἐνεβριμήσατο*, but **8**, B*, 1, 22, and 118, have *ἐνεβριμήθη*. In Verse thirty-two many codices have *ἄνθρωπον*.

Jesus proved that he was the Son of God by healing every species of human ill. Only a small part of Jesus' miracles has been recorded. Matthew alone reports the two present ones.

It had been foretold in prophecy that Christ should open the eyes of the blind; and in many ways did he fulfill the prophecy.

Jesus was on his way to his temporary domicile in Capharnaum when these two blind men follow him, and cry out: "Have mercy on us, thou Son of David." The Jews all recognized that the Messiah should be the Son of David. The Prophets and the Psalms were explicit and clear on this point; hence the blind men, by proclaiming Jesus to be the Son of David, acknowledged his Messiahship. This was the basis of their faith. The recognition of Jesus by the blind men is a strong rebuke to the Jewish people who rejected Christ. Blind men had poor means of coming into communication with the outside world. They were shut out from numerous evidences that were available to the Pharisees and to the Jewish people; and yet these poor men without the use of their eyes became convinced that Jesus was the Christ.

The next thing that we must note in the account is that Jesus does not answer their prayers immediately. He seems to give no heed to their petition, and allows them to follow after him, and clamor even till he reaches his domicile. But they persist, and follow him into the house. Their action was a proof of faith, and yet Jesus asks of them an explicit profession of faith, and then makes the effect dependent on the reality of their faith: "According to your faith, be it done unto you." The men had faith, and their eyes were opened. The benefits of Jesus to us are apportioned to us in proportion to our faith. There are many things that we study and labor much to obtain; and of how little value are they in comparison to our faith? A man spends a lifetime in studying out and perfecting some invention, or some theory. He may succeed, and men will give his name to the thing. He is a fool. Another man will spend his life acquiring property; he may succeed, and men may speak much of his great wealth. He also is a fool. Another man spends his life in an empty, aimless sort of existence; and he is a fool. But if a man should spend his whole

life in the one great study of how to acquire the fullness of faith, he would be the wisest of men. The defect of our lives is that eternal life is not real enough; faith makes it more real, and real things move us. We may with the blind men cry out to Jesus as he passes by: "Have mercy, O Son of David." But do we persist, and follow him, and persevere in faith and petition until he grants us our request? Do we not readily lose heart, and complain, or worst of all, doubt, when Jesus tests the perseverance of our faith?

On a certain day two men stood together on a street of one of our large cities. Both were young and finely endowed. There were grand possibilities in each life. They were speaking of their respective aims of life. Said one: "Five years ago I entered the leading factory of this city, and asked for work. I had nothing to recommend me except two strong arms, and an honest face. I started at the lowest grade of labor in the place. To-day I am the active superintendent of the whole works. I hope before I die to own the largest factory of its kind in the world."

The other man spoke more gravely, more modestly: "I shall with God's help try to realize in my life the grand counsel of Christ: 'If thou wouldst be perfect, sell what thou hast, and give to the poor and come and follow me.'"

Both men lived with the great aim of realizing what they had outlined that day. The first succeeded, and actually did found one of the greatest factories in the world. He was a good man, an honest man, a practical Catholic. He left an estate worth over a million dollars, and the world praised his industry, his business sagacity, his *brains*.

The other man lived and died unknown to the world. He lived a hidden life. Whatever time could be spared from his labor was spent in the churches, and in the homes of the poor. By that tenor of life he developed that wonderful spiritual intuition, that foretaste of the eternal joys of Heaven, which is given to the saints. By a strange combination of circumstances these men met once again in life. It was many years afterwards, at the hour of death of the great manufacturer. Both were old; within an hour the soul of one would be before its Judge; the other would soon follow. And

the dying man turned to the friend of his youth; and recalling the incident of many years ago, he declared; "I have succeeded, but now I must die; and now I realize how much wiser you were than I."

Who of us will not say that the man who chose the life of renunciation was the wiser? and yet we follow the other.

After the performance of the miracle, Christ as usual, sternly forbids the men to say aught of the effect that he wrought upon them. It was Christ's uniform line of conduct to forbid men to speak of his marvelous works. The reasons are the same as in the preceding miracle. Christ was not seeking human glory by his deeds: he wished by his works to draw men to have faith in his divine character; but in every way compatible with that great design did Jesus shun human recognition. Then again, we must always remember that Christ did not wish the revelation of his character to become too public until after his resurrection. Hence, we see that he adopted a different plan of action with different individuals. He bade the healed Gerasene demoniac go and publish the great miracle in his country; and the same did publish it through Decapolis. This was necessary. This wild country needed the knowledge of the miracle, that it might serve as a motive of credibility when Christ's legates should afterwards bring the message of salvation into their country. The country of the Gerasenes was not at any time a place of residence for Christ, and thus Christ could avoid the human praise, and glory resulting from the event, while the knowledge of the miracle was producing faith in the minds of men.

The two blind men disobeyed Christ's injunction, and they spread abroad the fame of Jesus in all that land. We are firmly persuaded that the blind men did no wrong in publishing this event. They understood the words of Christ as expressing a wish to renounce a recognition that was his due; and gratitude moved them to make public acknowledgment of his great benefit to them. We see also in the event how the fame which Jesus tried to avoid forced itself upon him, and in all these things he is the grand exemplar of all that is perfect in human life. In fact, if all other reasons were wanting, we

could find a true and sufficient cause for Christ's wish to conceal his miracles in the fact that he wished to give to the generations of men a grand example of noble detachment from the praise and flattery of the world.

Matthew records that as they went forth from the house, a dumb man, who had a devil, was presented to Jesus. And Jesus expelled the demon, and the man regained the use of speech. There is nothing special about the miracle. The cure of demoniacs was one of the most frequent of Christ's miracles. By such expulsion Jesus showed himself supreme over the infernal world. In the history of the Jewish people, it had never been known that a man speaking in his own name, and in virtue of his own power, could release a man from the power of Satan. Hence the multitudes marvel, and declare that it was never so seen in Israel.

The Pharisees recognize that the credit of Jesus is growing with the people. They must devise some means to discredit him. They can not deny his miracles. They are too evident. There is one means left. It is a fearful expedient, a horrible blasphemy; but they will do it. They will accuse the Lord Jesus of being in league with Satan himself; and of performing the expulsion of the demons by the power of the prince of demons. As Christ takes up and refutes this calumny in another place, we shall reserve our treatment of the charge until we are commenting that text.

MATT. X. 5—42.

5. These twelve Jesus sent forth, and charged them, saying: Go not into any way of the Gentiles, and enter not into any city of the Samaritans:

6. But go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel.

7. And as ye go, preach, saying: The kingdom of Heaven is at hand.

5. Τούτους τοὺς δώδεκα ἀπέστειλεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, παραγγείλας αὐτοῖς, λέγων: Εἰς ὁδὸν ἐθνῶν μὴ ἀπέλθητε, καὶ εἰς πόλιν Σαμαρειτῶν μὴ εἰσέλθητε.

6. Πορεύεσθε δὲ μᾶλλον πρὸς τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἀπολωλότα οἴκου Ἰσραήλ.

7. Πορεύόμενοι δὲ κηρύσσετε, λέγοντες: Ἡγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν.

8. Heal the sick, raise the dead, cleanse the lepers, cast out devils: freely ye received; freely give.

9. Get you no gold, nor silver, nor brass in your purses,

10. No wallet for your journey, neither two coats, nor shoes, nor staff: for the laborer is worthy of his food.

11. And into whatsoever city or village ye shall enter, search out who in it is worthy; and there abide till ye go forth.

12. And as ye enter into the house, salute it.

13. And if the house be worthy, let your peace come upon it: but if it be not worthy let your peace return to you.

14. And whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear your words, as ye go forth out of that house or that city, shake off the dust of your feet.

15. Verily I say unto you: It shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment, than for that city.

16. Behold, I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves: be ye therefore wise as serpents and guileless as doves.

17. But beware of men: for they will deliver you up to councils, and in their synagogues they will scourge you;

18. Yea and before governors and kings shall ye be brought for my sake, for a

8. Ἀσθενοῦντας θεραπεύετε, νεκροὺς ἐγείρετε, λεπροὺς καθαρίζετε, δαιμόνια ἐκβάλλετε: δωρεὰν ἐλάβετε, δωρεὰν δότε.

9. Μὴ κτήσῃσθε χρυσὸν, μὴ δὲ ἄργυρον, μὴ δὲ χαλκὸν εἰς τὰς ζώνας ὑμῶν.

10. Μὴ πῆραν εἰς ὁδόν, μὴ δὲ δύο χιτῶνας, μὴ δὲ ὑποδήματα, μὴ δὲ ῥάβδον, ἄξιός γάρ ὁ ἐργάτης τῆς τροφῆς αὐτοῦ.

11. Εἰς ἣν δ' ἂν πόλιν ἢ κώμην εἰσέλθῃτε, ἐξετάσατε τις ἐν αὐτῇ ἄξιός ἐστιν, καὶκεῖ μέναιτε ἕως ἂν ἐξέλθῃτε.

12. Εἰσερχόμενοι δὲ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν ἀσπάσασθε αὐτήν.

13. Καὶ ἐὰν μὲν ἡ ἡ οἰκία ἀξία, ἐλθέτω ἡ εἰρήνη ὑμῶν ἐπ' αὐτήν, ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ἡ ἀξία, ἡ εἰρήνη ὑμῶν πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐπιστραφήτω.

14. Καὶ ὃς ἂν μὴ δέξηται ὑμᾶς, μὴ δὲ ἀκούσῃ τοὺς λόγους ὑμῶν, ἐξερχόμενοι ἔξω τῆς οἰκίας ἢ τῆς πόλεως ἐκείνης, ἐκτινάξατε τὸν κοριοστὸν ἐκ τῶν ποδῶν ὑμῶν.

15. Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν: Ἀνεκτότερον ἔσται γῇ Σοδόμων καὶ Γομόρρων ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κρίσεως, ἢ τῇ πόλει ἐκείνῃ.

16. Ἴδού ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω ὑμᾶς ὡς πρόβατα εἰς μέσον λύκων, γίνεσθε οὖν φρόνιμοι ὡς οἱ ὄφεις, καὶ ἀκέραιοι ὡς αἱ περιστεραί.

17. Προσέχετε δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, παραδώσουσιν γὰρ ὑμᾶς εἰς συνέδρια, καὶ ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν μαστιγώσουσιν ὑμᾶς,

18. Καὶ ἐπὶ ἡγεμόνας δὲ καὶ βασιλεῖς ἀχθήσεσθε ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ, εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν.

testimony to them and to the Gentiles.

19. But when they deliver you up, be not anxious how or what ye shall speak: for it shall be given you in that hour what ye shall speak.

20. For it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father that speaketh in you.

21. And brother shall deliver up brother to death, and the father his child: and children rise up against parents, and cause them to be put to death.

22. And ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake: but he that endureth to the end, the same shall be saved.

23. But when they persecute you in this city, flee into the next: for verily I say unto you: Ye shall not have finished the cities of Israel, till the Son of man be come.

24. A disciple is not above his master, nor a servant above his lord

25. It is enough for the disciple that he be as his master, and the servant as his lord. If they have called the master of the house Beelzebub, how much more shall they call them of his household!

26. Fear them not therefore: for there is nothing covered, that shall not be revealed; and hid, that shall not be known.

27. What I tell you in the darkness, speak ye in the light:

19. Ὅταν δὲ παραδώσιν ὑμᾶς, μὴ μεριμνήσητε πῶς ἢ τί λαλήσητε, δοθήσεται γὰρ ὑμῖν ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ τί λαλήσητε.

20. Οὐ γὰρ ὑμεῖς ἐστέ οἱ λαλοῦντες, ἀλλὰ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ Πατρὸς ὑμῶν τὸ λαλοῦν ἐν ὑμῖν.

21. Παραδώσει δὲ ἀδελφὸς ἀδελφὸν εἰς θάνατον, καὶ πατήρ τέκνον: καὶ ἐπαναστήσονται τέκνα ἐπὶ γονεῖς, καὶ θανατώσουσιν αὐτούς.

22. Καὶ ἔσεσθε μισούμενοι ὑπὸ πάντων διὰ τὸ ὄνομά μου: ὁ δὲ ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος, οὗτος σωθήσεται.

23. Ὅταν δὲ διώκωσιν ὑμᾶς ἐν τῇ πόλει ταύτῃ, φεύγετε εἰς τὴν ἐτέραν: ἀμὴν γὰρ λέγω ὑμῖν: Οὐ μὴ τελέσητε τὰς πόλεις Ἰσραὴλ, ἕως ἔλθῃ ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

24. Οὐκ ἔστιν μαθητὴς ὑπὲρ τὸν διδάσκαλον, οὐ δὲ δοῦλος ὑπὲρ τὸν κύριον αὐτοῦ.

25. Ἀρχετὸν τῷ μαθητῇ ἵνα γένηται ὡς ὁ διδάσκαλος αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὁ δοῦλος ὡς ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ. Εἰ τὸν οἰκοδεσπότην Βεελζεβοῦλ ἐπεκάλεσαν, πόσῳ μᾶλλον τοὺς οἰκιακοὺς αὐτοῦ;

26. Μὴ οὖν φοβηθῆτε αὐτούς, οὐδὲν γὰρ ἔστιν κεκαλυμμένον, ὃ οὐκ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται, καὶ κρυπτόν, ὃ οὐ γνωσθήσεται.

27. Ὃ λέγω ὑμῖν ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ, εἴπατε ἐν τῷ φωτί, καὶ ὃ εἰς τὸ οὐς

and what ye hear in the ear, proclaim upon the housetops.

28. And be not afraid of them who kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him who is able to destroy both body and soul in hell.

29. Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing? and not one of them shall fall on the ground without your Father.

30. But the very hairs of your head are all numbered.

31. Fear not, therefore; ye are of more value than many sparrows.

32. Every one therefore who shall confess me before men, him will I also confess before my Father who is in Heaven.

33. But whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father who is in Heaven.

34. Think not that I came to send peace on the earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword.

35. For I came to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter in law against her mother in law:

36. And a man's foes shall be they of his own household.

37. He that loveth father or mother more than me is not

ἀκούετε, κηρύξατε ἐπὶ τῶν ὀροφάτων.

28. Καὶ μὴ φοβήθητε ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποκτεινόντων τὸ σῶμα, τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν μὴ δυνάμενων ἀποκτείνειν, φοβεῖσθε δὲ μᾶλλον τὸν δυνάμενον καὶ ψυχὴν καὶ σῶμα ἀπολέσαι ἐν γέεννῃ.

29. Οὐχὶ δύο στρουθία ἄσσα-ρίου πωλεῖται; καὶ ἓν ἐξ αὐτῶν οὐ πεσεῖται ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, ἄνευ τοῦ Πατρὸς ὑμῶν.

30. Ὑμῶν δὲ καὶ αἱ τρίχες τῆς κεφαλῆς πᾶσαι ἡριθμημέναι εἰσὶν.

31. Μὴ οὖν φοβεῖσθε, πολλῶν στρουθίων διαφέρετε ὑμεῖς.

32. Πᾶς οὖν ὅστις ὁμολογήσει ἐν ἑμοῖς ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὁμολογήσω καὶ γὼ ἐν αὐτῷ ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ Πατρὸς μου τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς.

33. Ὅστις δὲ ἀρνήσεται με ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἀρνήσομαι καὶ γὼ αὐτὸν ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ Πατρὸς μου τοῦ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

34. Μὴ νομίσητε ὅτι ἦλθον βαλεῖν εἰρήνην ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν: οὐκ ἦλθον βαλεῖν εἰρήνην, ἀλλὰ μάχαιραν.

35. Ἦλθον γὰρ διχάσαι ἄνθρωπον κατὰ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ θυγατέρα κατὰ τῆς μητρὸς αὐτῆς, καὶ νύμφην κατὰ τῆς πενθερᾶς αὐτῆς.

36. Καὶ ἐχθροὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, οἱ οἰκιακοὶ αὐτοῦ.

37. Ὁ φιλῶν πατέρα ἢ μητέρα ὑπὲρ ἐμέ, οὐκ ἔστιν μου ἀξίος καὶ

worthy of me; and he that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me.

38. And he that doth not take his cross and follow after me, is not worthy of me.

39. He that findeth his life shall lose it; and he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it.

40. He that receiveth you receiveth me, and he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent me.

41. He that receiveth a prophet in the name of a prophet shall receive a prophet's reward: and he that receiveth a righteous man in the name of a righteous man shall receive a righteous man's reward.

42. And whosoever shall give to drink unto one of these little ones a cup of cold water only, in the name of a disciple, verily I say unto you, he shall in no wise lose his reward.

MARK VI. 7—13.

7. Καὶ προσκαλεῖται τοὺς δώδεκα, καὶ ἤρξατο αὐτοὺς ἀποστέλλειν δύο δύο, καὶ ἐδίδου αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν τῶν πνευμάτων τῶν ἀκαθάρτων.

8. Καὶ παρήγγειλεν αὐτοῖς ἵνα μὴ δὲν αἴρωσιν εἰς ὁδόν, εἰ μὴ ράβδον μόνον, μὴ ἄρτον, μὴ πήραν, μὴ εἰς τὴν ζώνην χαλκόν.

9. Ἄλλ' ὑποδεδεμένους σανδάλια, καὶ μὴ ἐνδύσασθαι δύο χιτῶνας.

ὁ φίλων υἱὸν ἢ θυγατέρα ὑπὲρ ἐμὲ οὐκ ἔστιν μου ἄξιος.

38. Καὶ ὃς οὐ λαμβάνει τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀκολουθεῖ ὀπίσω μου, οὐκ ἔστιν μου ἄξιος.

39. Ὁ εὐρὼν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ, ἀπολέσει αὐτήν, καὶ ὁ ἀπολέσας τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ, εὕρησει αὐτήν.

40. Ὁ δεχόμενος ὑμᾶς, ἐμὲ δέχεται, καὶ ὁ ἐμὲ δεχόμενος, δέχεται τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με.

41. Ὁ δεχόμενος προφήτην εἰς ὄνομα προφήτου, μισθὸν προφήτου λήμψεται, καὶ ὁ δεχόμενος δίκαιον εἰς ὄνομα δικαίου, μισθὸν δικαίου λήμψεται.

42. Καὶ ἂν ποτίσῃ ἕνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων ποτήριον ψυχροῦ μόνον, εἰς ὄνομα μαθητοῦ, ἀμήν λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ ἀπολέσῃ τὸν μισθὸν αὐτοῦ.

LUKE IX. 1—6.

1. Συγκαλεσάμενος δὲ τοὺς δώδεκα, ἔδωκεν δύναμιν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ δαιμόνια, καὶ νόσους θεραπεύειν.

2. Καὶ ἀπέστειλεν αὐτοὺς κηρύσσειν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἰᾶσθαι.

3. Καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς: Μὴ δὲν αἴρετε εἰς τὴν ὁδόν, μήτε ράβδον, μήτε πήραν, μήτε ἄρτον, μήτε ἀργύριον, μήτε δύο χιτῶνας ἔχειν.

10. Καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς: Ὅπου ἂν εἰσέλθῃτε εἰς οἰκίαν, ἐκεῖ μένετε ἕως ἂν ἐξέλθῃτε ἐκεῖθεν.

11. Καὶ ὃς ἂν τόπος μὴ δέξηται ὑμᾶς, μὴ δὲ ἀκούσωσιν ὑμῶν, ἐκπορεύεσθαι ἐκεῖθεν ἐκτινάξατε τὸν χοῦν τὸν ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν, εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς.

12. Καὶ ἐξελθόντες ἐκήρυξαν ἴνα μετανοώσιν.

13. Καὶ δαιμόνια πολλὰ ἐξέβαλλον, καὶ ἡλiefon ἐλαίῳ πολλοὺς ἀρρώστους, καὶ ἐθεράπευον.

7. And he called unto him the twelve, and began to send them forth by two and two; and he gave them authority over the unclean spirits;

8. And he charged them that they should take nothing for their journey, save a staff only; no bread, no wallet, no money in their purse;

9. But to go shod with sandals: and, said he, put not on two coats.

10. And he said unto them: Wheresoever ye enter into a house, there abide till ye depart thence.

11. And whatsoever place shall not receive you, and they hear you not, as ye go forth thence, shake off the dust that is under your feet for a testimony unto them.

12. And they went out, and preached that men should repent.

4. Καὶ εἰς ἣν ἂν οἰκίαν εἰσέλθῃτε, ἐκεῖ μένετε, καὶ ἐκεῖθεν ἐξέρχεσθε.

5. Καὶ ὅσοι ἂν μὴ δέχωνται ὑμᾶς, ἐξερχόμενοι ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως ἐκεῖνης, τὸν κονιορτὸν ἀπὸ τῶν ποδῶν ὑμῶν ἀποτινάσσετε, εἰς μαρτύριον ἐπ' αὐτούς.

6. Ἐξερχόμενοι δὲ διήρχοντο κατὰ τὰς κώμας, εὐαγγελιζόμενοι καὶ θεραπεύοντες πανταχοῦ.

1. And he called the twelve together, and gave them power and authority over all devils, and to cure diseases.

2. And he sent them forth to preach the kingdom of God, and to heal the sick.

3. And he said unto them: Take nothing for your journey neither staff, nor wallet, nor money; neither have two coats.

4. And into whatsoever house ye enter, there abide, and thence depart.

5. And as many as receive you not, when ye depart from that city, shake off the dust from your feet for a testimony against them.

6. And they departed, and went throughout the villages, preaching the gospel, and healing everywhere.

13. And they cast out many devils, and anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them.

In the eighth verse of Matthew, the clause *νεκρὸς ἐγείρετε* is omitted in some emendations of **N**, and in E, F, G, K, L, M, S, U, V, X, **Γ**, **Π**, et al. It is also rejected by the Sahidic and Armenian versions and by some codices of the Syriac. Eusebius, Basil, and Jerome also reject it. But it is found in **N**^{*}, **N**^c, B, C^{*}, and D. It is found in the Ethiopian version, and Cyril, Hilary, Tischendorf, Westcott, and Hort endorse it. In Verse twelve the clause, *λέγοντες, εἰρήνη τῷ οἴκῳ τούτῳ*, is found in **N**^{*}, **N**^c, **N**^b, D, and L, and it is adopted by the Vulgate, Armenian and Ethiopian versions; but the best authorities omit it. In Verse sixteen, the common reading is *ἐν μέσῳ*, but B has *εἰς μέσον*. In Verse twenty-five there is considerable discrepancy among the codices regarding the name of the prince of demons. Most of the codices have *Βεελζεβούλ*.

In the ninth verse of Mark we find the reading *μὴ ἐνδύσῃσθε* in **N**, A, C, D, **Δ**, **Π**², et al. Tischendorf approves this reading. In Verse eleven *ὃς ἂν τόπος* occurs in **N**, B, L, and **Δ**, and it is approved by Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort; many authorities have *ὅσοι ἂν μὴ δέξωνται*.

In the first verse of the text of Luke, a few minor authorities add *μαθητάς* or *ἀποστόλους*. In Verse two, *ἰᾶσθαι* stands without an object in B, and in the Syriac of Cureton, and in the Sinaitic palimpsest Syriac.

In the Old Covenant, the first chosen people had sprung from twelve tribal chiefs; so in the new order of things, the chosen people of the New Law should be spiritually begotten by twelve apostolic fathers. The other mystic reasons assigned by certain Fathers to explain why Christ chose twelve apostles, seem devoid of foundation.

These twelve men were really to begin their great work after their baptism of Pentecostal fire. They were during Christ's life simply in the school of Christ; but the Lord Jesus employed them as aids in presenting his message to the cities

of Judæa, so that the Jews could not complain that Jesus had passed by any portion of their nation.

From Mark we learn that in the first mission Jesus sent the Apostles by two and two. This is an important detail. It shows the perfect knowledge that Jesus had of human nature, and his human sympathy. The Apostles were sent upon a difficult mission. They were to go among a hard and unbelieving people to preach a strange, new message. The Lord knew that if at least two were together, they would mutually encourage and comfort each other. Their mutual society and friendship would prevent that feeling of loneliness and sadness that is so apt to come upon a man, when he is engaged in a new enterprise that brings him among strangers, and is alone. The reason of this is that nature made man a social being; and he feels the deprivation of the sympathy and society of his fellow men. But we need not go into the realms of the speculative philosophy to understand this. We have felt it ourselves. If we have ever travelled in a strange country, if we have ever undertaken a difficult enterprise, we have felt how good a thing it is to have a companion, in whom we can confide, with whom we can counsel, and from whom we can receive encouragement. Paul understood this well in his labors, in which, though often alone, he longed for the society of his co-laborers. Witness the sadness of Paul in his loneliness: "Now when I came to Troas for the Gospel of Christ, and when a door was opened unto me in the Lord, I had no relief for my spirit, because I found not Titus my brother."—II. Cor. II. 12—13. And in the same Epistle he tells of his joy: "Nevertheless he that comforteth the lowly, God comforted us by the coming of Titus," etc.—Ibid. VII. 6.

The Lord gives the Apostles in this mission a strict injunction against preaching to the Gentiles, or to the Samaritans. The Jews were the seed of Abraham, God's chosen people. To them God had promised that a Redeemer should spring from the royal line of David. God was bound by his own promise to present first to the Jews the salvation which the Messiah should bring. Thus Jesus says in another place that he was not sent except to the lost sheep of the race of Israel. That is to say, that he was not bound in justice by virtue of any

preceding promise to any one, save the sons of Israel. Therefore, first of all, the message of Jesus must be presented to Israel. It is true, they were a degenerate race, lost sheep; but God had promised this to their race, and he would fulfill his promise. Hence, Jesus wished that the Apostles should first give all their attention exclusively to the work of announcing salvation to the Jews. The Gentiles and Samaritans would receive attention after the first work was well done. God intended to save the whole world. All flesh should see the salvation of God. But in this work the Jews were given a certain precedence in virtue of the promises made to the patriarchs. And this method was also adopted by Paul: "And Paul and Barnabas spoke out boldly and said: "It was necessary that the word of God should *first* be spoken to you. Seeing you thrust it from you; and judge yourselves unworthy of eternal life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles."—Acts XIII. 46. Salvation was for the Jew first, and then for the Greek. Salvation came to the Jews in virtue of God's faithfulness to his promises; it came to the Gentiles as a pure mercy of God. The Jews therefore can not ever complain that the Messiah preferred the Gentiles before the race of Israel. He concentrated his efforts upon the race of Abraham, and thus instructed his legates to do before turning to the Gentiles.

In calling the Jews the lost sheep of the house of Israel, the Lord points out that the legate of Christ should be for the people what the shepherd is for the flock of sheep. Christ is the great shepherd, and his ministers are subordinate shepherds. The sheep depend on the shepherd for guidance and for protection. They know his voice, they come at his call. The good shepherd is ever vigilant to protect the sheep from harm, and to lead them to rich pastures. And the minister of Christ, who is what Christ wished him to be, is in the spiritual life of his people what the Oriental shepherd is to his flock.

The burden of the message which the Apostles were bidden to announce was that the kingdom of Heaven was at hand. This was also the message preached by John the Baptist. This is the central theme of all religion. A new life is offered to men through Christ, and men are asked to prepare themselves for it. Heaven existed before the coming of Christ,

but it was not accessible to man. The great primal sin had closed it against man. Christ came down upon earth to take away that first sin, to open Heaven to man, and to teach him the way thither. The kingdom of Heaven is at hand now, but how little such consideration influences society? If in any portion of the earth's surface a mine of gold is found, there is a wild rush of eager mortals, who endure every hardship and peril to reach that land of gold; but from Heaven comes the message that the kingdom of Heaven is at hand, and men heed it not.

The message of Jesus Christ was not complete at the time that he sent the Apostles on this first mission, but they could, like John the Baptist, declare to the people that the Messiah was come. This truth aroused the people to give ear to the words of Jesus himself, when he in person appeared among them, and at such stage of the New Law the faithful acceptance of the yet partial communication would save the believer.

In the rude state of society then existing and before the Church had her perfect organization, men had need of some warrant more than the mere words of men to believe the great message of salvation. And so the Lord Jesus endowed his legates with the power of miracles, even to the extent of raising the dead.

The omission by many authorities of the clause, "raise the dead" is due to the fact that there is not recorded in the Gospel any case in which the Apostles exercised such power. They may or may not have wrought such a work. The conferring of the power does not necessitate that they used it then. The Lord simply confers upon them all power necessary adequately to fulfill their mission. If the raising of the dead would have promoted the cause for which they were sent, they had the power and the authority to work such miracle. Very little is written of the works which the Apostles wrought while on that mission. In the life of the Church there are many unrecorded miracles. Thus the Apostles in their first mission may have raised the dead of which no record has been handed down to us. The Gospel only makes known that they were furnished with such power; the exercise thereof depended on circumstances.

The conferring of such power on the Apostles was a great proof of the Divinity of Jesus Christ, for none but God can give to man such power over disease, demons, and death.

The Lord next cautions the Apostles against avarice. He bids them take no remuneration for the spiritual gifts that they were to impart to men. They had received these spiritual gifts freely from the Lord; they were bidden impart them to others in like manner. The liberality with which a thing is given us by another is an inducement to make us share with others. The reasons of this bidding of Christ are manifold. The high nature of a spiritual thing is debased, when it is made subject to barter. Then again it is a false conception of a spiritual thing to think that it can either be bought or sold. Certain spiritual things come from God to men through the instrumentality of men, but the only way that they may be possessed is to dispose the heart aright to receive the gift of God. To mix up the idea of temporal goods with the high nature of spiritual entities is the profanation of a sacred thing. Hence the Church has always considered it simony to exchange a spiritual thing for a material consideration. These spiritual creations are too high, too sacred, to be brought down into the vulgar mart, and made the subject of the avarice of man. God gives salvation freely to every man, and he is unwilling that man shall change his plan, and check the free course of salvation in any way by making it subject to mercenary considerations.

The next counsel of the Lord has reference to a perfect renunciation of all things, and an absolute reliance on God's providence. Hence he bids them take no money for their journey, not even the smaller money denominated as brass.

Matthew writes that the Lord bade the Apostles take no shoes; whereas Mark explicitly states that he bade them go forth shod with sandals. Some have endeavored to reconcile this by distinguishing between shoes and sandals. The sandal was a mere covering for the sole of the foot; while the shoe covered the whole foot. It seems more probable that when the Lord in Matthew's text bids the Apostles take with them no shoes, he means *no shoes except the ones they actually have on*. The shoes are mentioned immediately after the two coats,

and are subject to the same construction. That is, "Take no coat but the one actually worn, nor shoes other than the ones ye wear." This accords well with the statement of Mark; for the bidding to go shod with sandals is equivalent to the bidding to go provided with the one pair of sandals actually worn. The wallet was a receptacle for food for the day's journey; and they were forbidden even to make this provision. Mark and Luke add that they were even forbidden to take a loaf of bread with them on the way.

Matthew and Luke are concordant in stating that the Apostles were forbidden to take with them a staff for the journey; but Mark affirms that they were to take nothing for their journey save a staff only. To solve this difficulty Knaubenbauer adopts the opinion of Calmet, that if the Apostles had in their hands a staff, they might take it with them, as it was not an impediment, but a means of rendering the journey easier; but they were forbidden to procure a staff, if they were unprovided with one.

When a man was reduced to the staff which he carried in his hand, he was considered as reduced to absolute poverty. This is beautifully expressed in the prayer of Jacob: "—for with my staff, I crossed over this Jordan; and now I am become two companies." Maldonatus explains the present difficulty thus: "The Evangelists do not in all cases relate the exact words of Christ. In many cases, they give the substance in their own words, and in this they are dependent on their memories. Now any divergency in their statements that does not affect the substance of the account is attributable to the writers' free choice of words and expressions." The divine influence of inspiration only regards the substance. In the present case all the Evangelists agree in recording the essential fact that the Apostles were sent forth without any provision for the journey. Matthew and Luke express this by removing from the Apostles even the possession of a staff; while Mark believes that the same substantial fact can be better expressed by limiting the things that they carry with them to a staff. Of course, in this opinion it is believed that the writers did not have in mind the exact words of Jesus, but only the substance.

This theory applies to the entire body of the New Testament. In many cases we do not know the exact words of Christ, but we are never left in doubt as regards the sense.

The Evangelists wrote Christ's message as they remembered it. They were so moved and directed by the divine afflatus of inspiration that they handed down the substance of the message in all its integrity. In this they are in perfect accord. But in the choice of words and expressions they exercised the free use of their faculties, and hence there are many verbal divergencies found in their accounts. Historical truth does not demand that there shall be a verbal identity when two or more men relate the same thing. The Gospels are true as history demands a writing to be true. Christ delivered to his Apostles that they were to go forth on their journey without *any provision* for the journey. They were to rely totally on God's care. To express this great truth, one Evangelist employs one manner of expression, another Evangelist employs another form identical in substance, slightly different in detail. Often the reason of these differences in words and details was the need of adapting the discourse to different peoples. Expressions which were familiar to the Jews would lose their meaning in a message to the Gentiles. The divergency here touching the shoes, and the staff is easily explained by this principle.

The Lord sent forth these Apostles on their first mission thus unprovided with the necessities of life as a great lesson to themselves, and to their successors. In after times, he appealed to this event, and asked them if they suffered want when thus sent forth. It was not a method to be literally employed by his Apostles, or by their successors. We have seen that even the Apostles, while in the company of Jesus, had some money which Judas carried. Though Paul was most unworldly, and would receive nothing from the churches, except from the Philippians, yet he exhorted the Christians to contribute to the support of those who preached to them the Gospel. Hence Jesus' action in this first mission of the Apostles was a grand exemplary lesson. In the first place, it taught them that the providence of God would care for them while engaged in apostolic work. For that reason Jesus makes of it

a test case. They were sent forth unprovided with even a loaf of bread, and God cared for them. There never could come a time when they would go forth with less provision, and as they had proven God's providential care in this extreme case, they would not be disposed to doubt of it in the future. Secondly, the spirit of Christ's words in this instance is the grand norm of detachment which should characterize the minister of Christ in the New Law. While Christ's words do not constitute a literal precept regarding his legate's possession of the goods of this world, nevertheless they establish the absolute standard by which to measure our lives in the matter of detachment from the world, and trust in God. Christ's minister may have two coats, the second pair of shoes, and some money in his pocket, and not in any degree transgress the spirit of these words; but he can not become attached to any material thing without in some measure coming short of the grand ideal outlined by Christ. The work which the legate of Christ is appointed to do is to draw men away from this world, and attach them to Heaven. To do this well it is fitting that the leader himself should be detached from the world. It does not appear honest for a man to essay to teach men the unprofitableness of the goods of this world, when men know that the preacher himself is eager to grasp and retain all that he can of the world. Those to whom he ministers may believe still in Christ's teachings, but it will not be in virtue of the example of the man whom Christ appointed to be the light of the world. The minister of Christ may use the world; he may retain a title to property, and yet fulfill the counsel of Christ. But this is very difficult. If a man retains possession of property only to promote thereby the cause of religion, he fulfills perfectly the law of Christ. This is the only conception of property that will not hinder the perfection of the man of God. But it is so easy for the poor human heart to love earthly possessions, that we find but few who arrive at the perfect degree of the ideal apostolic life. A man will not be sent to hell for not having arrived at the supreme degree of that perfect life, but in the judgment, a man must expect a limited reward for imperfect service; and O, what folly it is to exchange any part of the portion of Christ for things which can serve us only through

the short period of our earthly pilgrimage? Is not such a man like unto Esau, who sold the rights and blessings of the firstborn for a mess of pottage?

God's law is so strongly opposed to the world, because the world is a rival with God for the love of men. And it is a sad farce when a man offers himself to represent the cause of Christ among men, and yet makes of that very ministry a means of getting and holding the very things which he by virtue of his office is bound to teach men to despise and renounce.

There was but one thing which Christ would have the Apostles receive, on that first mission, in return for their preaching, and that was food and shelter in the homes of the people. And in regard to this he would have them lodge with a worthy one; and having found a suitable lodging, he forbade them to change it while in any city or village. It was fitting that the representatives of the message of Christ should be in the house of upright, religious people. Otherwise they would be out of harmony with their surroundings; and it would injure their cause, if they lodged with a man of irreligious character. They could not know the characters of the citizens of the cities and towns by personal experience, hence they are bidden inquire out who was a faithful servant of God, with whom they might lodge. They were not bidden inquire who was the richest one, or where they might have the finest entertainment. The Lord sent forth men of religious characters to invite men to enter the kingdom of Heaven; and he would have them lodge in the house of one who was worthy of the kingdom of Heaven and where the religious environment would be in keeping with the characters of the messengers of the Messiah. And moreover, such a one would more readily afford hospitality to the Apostles. They were forbidden to change their hospice, for the reason that such changing might cause a belief that they were seeking better entertainment, and that they gave attention to the comforts of life. A blessing went with the Apostles; and therefore they were commanded to salute the house in which they were received. This salutation was the invocation of a blessing from Heaven upon the house. This blessing was to be invoked not only upon the house in which they were harbored, but upon every house into which they entered.

This is evident from the fact that the words of the Lord contemplate the possible case of the Apostles' entry into an unworthy house; whereas they were never to take up their residence in such a house.

Acting in the spirit of these words, the Church ordains that the priest when visiting the sick shall salute the house as soon as he enters it, asking that the peace of Heaven may descend upon it. Protestantism has rejected all these benedictions as the inventions of priestcraft. It is evident that Christ considered his ministers as being endowed with special spiritual gifts, which they might impart to others; but protestantism has no such ministers. It is a cold, hard, soulless thing, without any communion of saints, without any priesthood, without any sacrifice. But the Catholic Church keeps close to the spirit of Christ, and man can see in her constitution and her laws the impress of every word and deed in the life of Christ. She it is who consecrates days to honor every chief event in Christ's life. In fact, her whole liturgy is framed to make every year of the Church's life a reproduction of the life of Jesus. She has her Advent of penance and preparation for his coming. During that time every utterance of the Church's liturgy is an expression of expectancy and desire of the Messiah. On the night of the Nativity she watches with the shepherds, and hears the Angel's message that the Babe of Bethlehem is born. She goes with them to adore the infant Christ in the manger. She follows the Magi of the East up to Jerusalem, and thence to Bethlehem to pay homage to the King of the Jews. She hears the angel's message to Joseph, to take the child, and flee into Egypt. She weeps with the mothers of Bethlehem over the slaughter of the Holy Innocents. She goes to Nazareth with the Holy Family, and keeps ever before the eyes of men the holy tenor of the life at Nazareth. Year after year men hear from her the records of Jesus' words and deeds. She has the key to the mysteries, to reveal to man as much as it is expedient that he know here. She has caught and preserved every precept and counsel that Christ gave, and these she places before men. She fasts with him forty days in the wilderness. She will not partake of flesh meat on Friday, that she may suffer something in honor of the Crucifixion.

Wherever she erects for herself a temple, it is surmounted by the cross. On her forehead is a cross; on her raiment are crosses; she does no action without the sign of the cross. She mourns for the buried Jesus, and she rejoices on Easter morn at his glorious Resurrection. She receives his final commands, and follows him out of Jerusalem over against Bethany, where he was lifted up into Heaven. Men might forget these truths, but the Church cannot forget or neglect them. Compare her pulsating with warm spiritual life, abounding with manifold sanctifying agencies, to the cold, lifeless worldliness of protestantism, and then judge which is the Church of Christ.

In the thirteenth verse of the text of Matthew there is both a textual and exegetical difficulty. If we follow the Greek text we must translate the two verbs in the imperative mood, "let your peace come upon it," and "let your peace return to you." An exactly parallel instruction is recorded by St. Luke X. as having been given to the seventy disciples, and in Luke's text both verbs are in the future tense. Hence by the canon that an obscure text must be interpreted by a clearer parallel passage, if available, we judge that the expression of Matthew is a Hebraism to express the same truth that Luke more clearly expresses by the future tense; and the sense of both passages is that Christ is affirming what will inevitably happen under certain conditions.

It is plain enough to see how, in the event that the house were worthy, the blessing of peace would come upon it; but it is difficult to understand just what is meant by affirming that, in the event of the unworthiness of the house, the peace would return to the Apostles. It is perhaps best explained that if the house be unworthy the blessing would return to the Apostles in the sense that it would increase their merit. The merit of the Apostles consisted in the fact that they did the good work of blessing, and it was immaterial, as far as regarded their merit, whether or not the house were worthy.

The blessing which the Apostles were to bestow upon the houses was a sacred thing. It is ordinarily wrong to bestow a sacred thing upon an unworthy subject; and the Apostles might have been perplexed to know how they should discern the worthy from the unworthy house. The Lord tells them to

bless every house; and if the house be worthy, the blessing of Heaven would rest upon it; but if it were unworthy there would be no profanation of a sacred thing; for the blessing of Heaven would not be left in the possession of the unworthy subject. The Lord speaks thus to aid their minds to grasp the fact. The real method of action employed by God in these blessings was that, in virtue of the Apostles' blessing, he conferred upon the objects of that blessing favors. Now, in case of the unworthy subject, God withheld the blessings asked for; and the blessing is said to return to the Apostles, to show them, first, that there was no profanation of a sacred thing; and, secondly, that God rewarded the Apostles themselves for pronouncing a blessing upon a house whose unworthiness compelled him to withhold the gift.

The Apostles represent the cause of Christ; therefore to reject them was to reject the cause of Christ himself. What a terrible thing it is to reject Christ appears from the strong denunciation here pronounced by Christ. All human speech is filled with exaggerations, and inaccuracies; and thus we become accustomed not to accept with rigorous exactness the statements of mortals. But Jesus spoke not so. At times, it is true, he made use of popular phrases and aphorisms, but here evidently he is expressing a sober fact. The terrible fate of Sodom and Gomorrah is known to the civilized world. They were the chief cities of the five cities of the lower valley of the Jordan. For their unnatural crimes, they were deluged with fire from Heaven, and not a being escaped except Lot and his two daughters. Upon the site of those cities now lies the Dead Sea, on whose desolate shores no human habitation is found. The destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah is the most terrible record of the visitation of God's wrath in the history of man. Their sin was great. Even the night before their destruction, the people of Sodom endeavored to commit a sodomitical assault upon the angels who came to the house of Lot in the guise of men. And yet the Lord Jesus says that it will be more tolerable in the day of judgment for these cities than for the city that shall not receive Christ's legates. The greatest sin which it is possible for the creature to commit is hatred of God; and the rejection of Christ's message is akin to that great sin.

The sin of Sodom was great, but a greater dishonor is offered to God by the creature who in malice refuses the means of salvation extended to him. The Apostles are commanded to shake off the dust from their feet in leaving such a city, as a sign that the very dust thereof is accursed by the sin of the inhabitants. These are fearful words. God's punishments are as mysterious as are his other works. Not alone in that day was it possible to fall under this terrible sentence. Whenever a man, to whom the message of salvation has come, rejects Jesus Christ, he places himself with those whose judgment will be more terrible than that of Sodom and Gomorrah.

To refuse to receive Jesus Christ is wilfully to reject the evidence that he presents to men of the truth of Christianity, and thereby to refuse to enter the Church and recognize her authority. The all-just God will not punish for that cause a man to whom the evidence of Christianity has not come. Only God can judge just how far men are in this respect culpable; but the dreadful possibility is there that men in every age of the world may incur this fearful judgment. This thought ought to frighten many who are puffed up with their worldly knowledge, and who treat the great message of Christianity as a theme for jesting. Others put the thought of Christianity aside in cold indifference, as something impractical, a thing that appeals not to their tastes. There never was an age of such lawlessness in men's thoughts of religion. Outside of the Catholic Church there is no obedience of faith in a mysterious message that came from heaven, but men "will not endure the sound doctrine; but having itching ears they heap to themselves teachers after their own lusts, and they turn away their ears from the truth, and turn aside unto fables."

The gravity of the crime of rejecting Christianity may be judged from the fact that Jesus Christ died in order to give to man the message of redemption. To reject Christianity is to despise the death of the Son of God.

The Lord now passes from a consideration of the particular mission of the Apostles to the cities of Judæa, to a treatment of their universal mission to all nations. This is evident from the fact that in this first expedition they experienced none of the things outlined in the present discourse. The transition was

easy from their preliminary, preparatory mission to a consideration of their great life's work in evangelizing the world. The terrible dangers and sufferings that awaited them were foretold; first, so that they might be the more prepared to meet them; and secondly, that they might know that such things were foreknown and permitted by their divine Master.

By the comparison of the sheep in the midst of wolves the Lord well portrays the character of the true minister of Christ, and the character of the world. The sheep is by nature gentle, defenseless, inoffensive. The wolf is rapacious, lawless, savage. The sheep cannot defend its rights against the wolf: if it is saved from him it must be by some higher power. The wolf naturally hunts the sheep to prey upon it. Now the world is cruel and savage in its persecution of Christ and of those of Christ's fold. And he would have his cause triumph not by opposing force to force, but by meekly suffering the world's wrongs. Christ intended that his legates should overcome the world, not by force, but by non-resistance and patient suffering. And he found men that would follow this law, and Christianity took possession of the world by this method. Of course, this method never would have wrought the mighty effects that it has achieved were it not that there was back of these causes the power of God.

The Apostles are next exhorted to be prudent as serpents, and guileless as doves. The qualities of prudence and innocence are brought out in greater relief by reference to two creatures so different in natural characteristics as the serpent and the dove. Though prudence and innocence are not opposite in character, nevertheless one tempers the other, preventing an excess. The prudence, or rather subtlety, of the serpent is proverbial. Even in Genesis, III. 1, we read that "the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field which the Lord God had made." Observation of the habits of the serpent certainly justifies this popular persuasion. But subtlety like to that of the serpent is often accompanied by craftiness, deceit, and duplicity; hence the Lord would have this prudence combined with the guilelessness of a dove. The dove has always been regarded as the symbol of purity, gentleness and peace. Now the blending of these two qualities in the man of God

effects that admirable combination so necessary for God's important work. The work of the legate of Christ is an extremely delicate one. He must be the guide of souls through the perilous journey of life. On his judgment depend tremendous issues. Men seek out a prudent careful physician, when it is a question of the body's ailments; how much greater is the need of a prudent man, when human souls are in question? The mistakes of a legate of Christ are not like the mistakes of other men. Other men may err in judgment, and affect only themselves; but full oft the legate of Christ must judge in the cause of life or death of the souls of men. Then again the legate of Christ needs prudence to avoid the snares and tricks that will be laid for himself by the cunning tempter, and to save the cause which he represents from unwise measures in its dealings with the world. By employing this same prudence which he counsels to his Apostles, Jesus frequently reduced to silence his adversaries, and escaped their plots, until having completed his work, he voluntarily offered himself up.

In predicting the treatment that his Apostles should receive from men, the Lord considers them as representatives of the Christian name; and he is therein predicting what should come upon all his followers. We all know how truly the prediction was fulfilled. It is evident that the councils here spoken of by the Lord are the Sanhedrins of the cities of Judæa. The Apostles and their followers were brought before these; they were scourged in the synagogues. In Acts, XXII. 19, Paul confesses that he beat in every synagogue and imprisoned every one that believed in Jesus Christ; and again in Acts XXVI. 11, he confesses that he punished the followers of Jesus oftentimes in all the synagogues. They were brought before the Gentile governors and kings, as Paul was brought before Felix the governor of Cæsarea, as Peter and Paul were brought before Nero, as John was brought before Domitian, and as the vast army of the early Christians were brought before their respective rulers.

But this very arraignment of the followers of Christ before the rulers will be a testimony to both Jew and Gentile; for the defense of the Christians will spread the knowledge of Christ, and their constancy and virtue will impress even the execu-

tioners themselves. Thus we observe that full oft the trial and execution of one Christian was the means of converting many to the cause of Christ.

The Apostles, and in them the Christians, are exhorted not to be filled with anxiety as to the matter of their defense, and the mode of its presentation. By this they were not forbidden to use prudently their human faculties in their defense, but they were comforted by the assurance that they would not be alone in their defense; the Spirit of God would inspire them with wisdom and help their speech so that they would be in nothing wanting. By the fulfilment of this promise it was often verified that the tender youth and the unlettered peasant put to silence orators and philosophers. The cause of Christ at that stage of its development needed such extraordinary aid, and it received it.

The hatred of the cause of Christ perverted nature in many, and we know from history how the tenderest ties were broken, and the Christians were delivered up to death by the nearest of kin.

During the persecutions it was reputed a greater crime to be a Christian than to be a parricide or a poisoner. Tertullian testifies that the sole name of Christian condemned a man.

Through that fearful test it was not expected that every one would persevere. Hence the Lord adds that the reward is only for the one who perseveres even to the end. Doubtless the remembrance of those words gave hope, and strength, and perseverance to many a martyr, while undergoing the terrible tortures to which they were subjected. It was a consolation also to the Christians, when they were considered a common enemy of mankind, to know that it had been predicted by the Master, and that it was for his name's sake.

The twenty-third verse of Matthew especially applies to the Apostles. It is a prudent counsel regarding how they should conduct themselves in persecution. They were not appointed Apostles merely to obtain Heaven by martyrdom. They were to evangelize the world. Hence, when they had sowed the seed of the word of God in any city, and a persecution thereby was aroused which threatened their lives, they were to flee into another city, and there operate for the cause

of Christ. By such flight they did not flee as a hireling in the face of danger and abandon their sheep; but they prudently preserved their lives in order to fulfill the great work committed to them. The whole world was the field of their operations, and it would not promote the cause of Christ, if they should rashly court death. There was need that they should cover as much territory as possible during their lives; and the flight which Christ commanded promoted the cause of the Gospel. The Christian people were not abandoned. The Apostles appointed priests and bishops to care for every flock. It would be to flee as a hireling, if an Apostle through fear of danger, refused to enter any place wherein the Gospel of Christ was to be preached. It would be to flee as a hireling, if an Apostle denied Christ in the face of danger, thereby giving scandal to the people. This the first Apostles did not. But they were commanded by Christ prudently to preserve their lives in order to labor for the great cause of the Gospel. The cause of a priest or bishop now is different. Such a one is appointed permanently to administer a definite part of Christ's vineyard, and if danger of any kind threatens his flock, his duty is to remain and protect and minister to his people even unto death. And if he does less, he is a hireling. Though the present discourse of Jesus does not directly apply to the people, it is evident that it is lawful for them to flee from persecution. In fact, it would be prudence for a man who feared that he might not be strong enough to stand the ordeal to flee. Such a one does not deny Christ; he flees to escape the danger of denying Christ. Of course, in case of one on whom no further work depended, it would be grander to go forth and proclaim Jesus Christ right in the face of death, but it is not given to all to be heroes to that extent; and God's mercy finds a place for even weaker ones.

The second clause of the verse is not easy to understand. In the first place it is not easy to know what Christ means by his coming there spoken of. Not a few interpret it of the resurrection of Christ; others of the fall of Jerusalem. The usual sense of this expression always refers to the second coming of Christ at the end of time. It seems therefore that in this expression Christ considers the Apostles as perpetuated in their

successors, as an everlasting body; and he declares to them that they will not succeed in converting the Jews to the cause of Christ till the last days. There is an air of obscurity in Christ's words, as is usual in prophetic declarations. It is very probable that the Apostles did not understand him then. His words may have left the impression that the second coming was soon to take place. All this is compatible with the truth that the ministers of his Gospel would not effect the conversion of the Jewish race till the last days, till the fullness of the Gentiles should be gathered in.

The Lord next proceeds to declare to the Apostles what they might expect from men, from what he himself had received. He was the Master, they were his disciples; he was the Lord of the house; they were the servants.

It is not recorded in any part of the Scriptures that the enemies of Christ called him Beelzebub; but they declared that he operated in the power of Beelzebub, and that he had Beelzebub, within him to whom was due his great works; and this was equivalent to the calling of Christ Beelzebub.

Now the argument is plain and simple. Men who were not restrained from outrageous treatment of the Lord of the house would not respect his servants.

As noted above, the reading Beelzebul occurs in many Greek codices instead of Beelzebub. Lesêtre believes that the name Beelzebul means "the Lord of the habitation," and that they thus changed the name to make of this god the chief of the infernal kingdom. It seems more probable that the variant arose from a confusion of the two final letters, a thing which often happens in the case of the final letters of words. Thus we find Beliar for Belial, and Bab-el-Mandel for Bab-el-Mandeb. Beelzebub means the fly god. By such name the idol of Ekron was known; and mention is made of this god in II. [IV.] Kings, I. 2; and by Josephus, Antiq. IX. II. 1. Thus speaks Josephus: "Now it happened that Ahaziah, as he was coming down from the top of his house, fell down from it, and in his sickness sent to the 'fly god,' *πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν μύαν*, which was the god of Ekron." Many have believed that this god was thus termed because, he was invoked against flies and other insects. When we come to examine the name, we find that in its strict

etymology it does not mean the god of flies, or lord of flies, but the fly god, that is to say, the god in the form of a fly. Thus we find Dagon the fish god, the calf god of Moab, the cat god of Egypt, and many other similar cases. Hence we believe that this god was thus named for the reason that his idol at Ekron was in the form of a gigantic fly. We can readily conceive the feelings of terror which such a gigantic idol would create in the minds of his superstitious adorers. It is quite probable that, in the times immediately preceding Christ, this god had become the most famous of all the deities of the Philistines; and hence the god became identified with Satan the prince of devils.

Now the prediction of Christ while it was an irrefragable argument of what the Apostles might expect, was also a source of encouragement to them. They could feel that they were thus persecuted because they were identified with the cause of Christ, and that this very persecution was the best evidence that they well represented his cause.

The Lord next exhorts his followers to a noble courage. The message of Christ could not have been adequately presented to the world by men lacking in courage. The Lord proposes as the motive of this courage the fact that the great truth of Christ was to conquer the world; therefore there is no reason why men should fear who are advocates of a cause that is sure to win. It was the will of God that the Gospel of Christ should be preached to the world by men. No cause or combination of causes could defeat that purpose. This message is spoken of as being "covered" and "hid;" for the reason that it embodied mysteries which men could not have known, had not God revealed them to them. Christ speaks of his communication to men as having been spoken in darkness, in the sense that there was need during his mortal life to draw a certain veil of mystery over many things contained in his great message. In like manner he spoke things which the Apostles only "heard in the ear;" that is to say, these things were communications committed to the Apostles to be kept by them till the time should come to preach Christ to the universal world. Now it is evident that Christ must die and rise again before his complete message could be presented to the world.

Hence in his school of Apostles he placed a deposit of truth that was to be delivered to the world after the consummation of Christ's great work.

In the East the tops of houses are flat, and furnish a favorable site whence to deliver a proclamation to the people. Wherefore to speak a thing from the housetops became a figurative expression to denote the publishing of a thing far and wide.

Now it is evident that Christ's present instructions refer not to the first mission of the Apostles to the cities of Judæa; but these words outline the great work which these men were called to do after the coming of the Holy Ghost. They were not to fear; because God willed that the work in which they were engaged should not fail. The Apostles might meet death, but what is the death of a righteous man as God sees it? Is it failure? Is it a thing to be feared? No; the righteous man loses nothing by death; he gains everything thereby. Jesus Christ triumphed while he died on the cross; and so it was to be with his Apostles. As long as they were necessary for the preaching of the message, they would be kept alive; no power could take their lives from them. And when their work was done, then the Master would allow them to drink the chalice which he drank, and seal their message with their blood. Evidently men engaged in such a work, and supported thus by divine power should fear nothing.

The Lord Jesus knew the terrible force of persecution that would be hurled against his Apostles; hence to encourage them still more, he proposes the doctrine of unwise fear and wise fear.

In the twenty-eighth verse of Matthew the truth is forcibly enunciated by Christ, that there is only one real evil, and that evil is sin. This evil alone we should fear. The effect of sin is an eternity in hell, and this is associated with sin as one object of fear. To the saint of God the death of the body is only the breaking of the obstacle which holds us away from God. As St. Paul says:

"For we know that if the earthly house of our tabernacle be dissolved, we have a building from God, a house not made with hands, eternal, in the heavens. For verily in this we

groan, longing to be clothed upon with our habitation which is from heaven: if so be that being clothed we shall not be found naked. For indeed we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened; not for that we would be unclothed, but that we would be clothed upon, that what is mortal may be swallowed up of life. Now he that wrought us for this very thing is God, who gave unto us the earnest of the Spirit. Being therefore always of good courage, and knowing that, whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord (for we walk by faith, not by sight); we are of good courage, I say, and are willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be at home with the Lord. Wherefore also we make it our aim, whether at home or absent, to be well pleasing unto him.”—II. Corinthians V. 1—9.

The only death therefore that is to be feared is eternal perdition in hell. It is called death not in the sense that it is a cessation of life, but because it is an eternity of suffering. As St. John says in the Apocalypse: “And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and Hades gave up the dead which were in them: and they were judged, every man according to his works. And death and Hades were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death even the lake of fire.”

To fear God as here commanded by Christ is to fear to offend God by sin, whose punishment is so fearful. This is the fear that is the foundation of wisdom. It was this high wisdom that moved Jerome to cry out in the desert; “Through fear of hell, I have condemned myself to this solitude.” How cowardly we are! We fear every temporal ill; but we do not fear in proper degree the one only real evil, sin and its effect, eternal death.

Two classes of evils affect the life of man. One class is composed of created causes. These can afflict a man’s body; they can take away his substance; they can dishonor him before men; they can take away his liberty; they can torture him; yea, they can take away man’s life, but here they stop; they can not exert any influence upon the soul. In fact, it may be that even while these causes are crushing and destroying the body, the soul is being incalculably benefitted thereby. There is another class of evils which consists of the punish-

ments of God. The supreme degree of these punishments is the condemnation to hell for all eternity. Now the former class of evils, if suffered by us for a righteous cause, are real blessings, inestimable blessings; but the evils of the second category are absolute evils. Hence when the evils of the first class come upon us on account of our attachment to righteousness, they are not to be feared; for the reason that they then become the greatest benefits. But it is wisdom always to fear the evils of the second class. These latter can never be anything but positive evils, and they affect the eternal interests of the soul. And yet what do we find? The age is growing effeminate and cowardly in relation to the ills of this life; but few men think much of things that affect the soul for eternity. Men are very active in devising means to check disease and to prolong life; but no great amount of the world's thought is expended on the soul's life.

The righteous man, even though he be the most wretched of the sons of men, can console himself by two considerations. If he suffers for the sake of Christ, he can be comforted by the consideration that he is thereby meriting an eternity of happiness; and secondly, he knows that in a few brief years the sufferings will be over. But in the sufferings of the second category there is no consolation, no hope; despair and an eternity of suffering are the portion of the reprobate. These are the evils that men should fear.

The Lord next adds as a motive of holy courage the fact that the Providence of God closely watches over the righteous man. Jesus illustrates this by a comparison between man and some of the smallest creatures of earth. In the time of Christ, the *as* was a bronze Roman coin of the value of about one cent of our money. Now the Lord uses the diminutive of the *as*, *ἀσσάριον*, to denote the smallest piece of current money. And yet for this smallest piece of money two sparrows could be bought. It is as much as to say that one sparrow was of such little price that it could not be bought and sold alone, as there was no piece of money current small enough to be exchanged therefor.

It is evident that in the days of Christ, it must have been customary for sparrows to be sold, in the manner that small

birds of all descriptions are sold in the markets in Italy. The general Providence of God watches over all his creatures so closely that even the fall of a sparrow upon the earth, or anything else connected with its life does not happen without the supervision of God's Providence. Now man is the being for whom God created the earth and all things therein; wherefore it is evident that nothing affecting man can happen without the disposition of God's Providence. And this Providence has care of everything, even the least things in the life of man. To express this more forcibly, Christ declares that the very hairs of the head of the children of men are numbered, so that one of them can not be lost without God's knowledge.

Here we have a Being of absolutely infinite power pledging to man a watchfulness even to the guarding of each particular hair of one's head, and he bids man, when engaged in good work, not to fear. Nothing that is evil can happen to the righteous man pursuing after righteousness; for though causes may conspire even to take his life, God will make of that loss of life a richer possession of eternal life.

In the next sentence, Christ proposes the reward for confessing a belief in his name; and the punishment for denying him. It was necessary to establish man's duty in this regard, and the consequences of his action; for the time would soon come when men would have to choose between denial of Christ or the torture and death. It is not enough to hold the faith of Christ in the heart; "for with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation."—Rom. X. 10.

The words of Christ in the present passage establish that it is a strict Christian obligation to confess Christ before men whenever circumstances require such confession. They establish that the reward of such confession shall be that Christ before his Father in Heaven will acknowledge the confessor as his own, an heir to his kingdom. And the punishment of one who shall deny Christ shall be his rejection by Christ in the judgment.

Moved by the spirit of these words the Church always condemned as apostates every one who, even on the rack or

the gridiron, or scalded by boiling oil or pitch, or in any other torment, denied Christ.

In our days the sin would be equally great, to deny, for any cause whatsoever, that we are Catholics.

Of course the precept is much more strict in its prohibitive sense than in its affirmative sense. There is no cause conceivable that can justify a denial of Christ; but it is not always necessary or expedient at all times or places to make a formal confession of faith. But when the issue meets us squarely where men have a right to expect that a man shall define his religious stand, then nothing short of a positive formal confession of Christ will satisfy the Christian's obligation.

Christ is the author of peace, the prince of peace; his kingdom is a kingdom of peace. But it is not a sluggish inactive peace, it is not inertia, but active peace. Christ promulgated to man a truth above all other truths; he proposed to man something to love above all other loves. Now that supreme love naturally must clash with inferior opposite loves. Hence though the message of Christ moved all men to peace, it was the occasion of warfare; for the powers of the world would oppose it, and hence would arise the conflict. In transforming the world from paganism to Christianity, Christ foresaw and predicted that families should be divided; that the tenderest ties of consanguinity and affinity would often oppose his cause. In saying that a man's foes shall be they of his own household, Christ is not asserting a thing that ordinarily happens in human society, but only the extreme case which shall be verified in the world's opposition to the Gospel. Naturally the members of one's own household love one; but so bitter was to be the opposition to the message of Christ that it would turn the tenderest love into hate and persecution.

The prophet Micah, VII. 6, in describing the great moral decadence that preceded the Babylonian Captivity declares: "For the son dishonoreth the father, the daughter riseth up against her mother, the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law; a man's enemies are the men of his own house." Christ employs the prophetic words of Micah to describe the fierce conflict between Christianity and paganism. In that combat so bitter was the hatred of Christianity that it per-

verted nature, and men delivered unto death those bound to them by the closest ties of blood. In the history of the early Church we learn that parents delivered their children to death, and in fact Christ's declaration was literally fulfilled. Christ was the cause of this unnatural hate not that he willed it, but in that he called men to a manner of life that moved the world to such opposition. In a lesser degree Christ's words are fulfilled throughout the ages when the love of kindred opposes itself to the high call of God. When God calls, we do right to follow, even though our dearest kindred oppose the call.

Christ will have no compromises. He and his law must be supreme; and any man who loves any created thing more than him is unworthy of him, and is rejected by him. Jesus Christ has commanded the love of parents; but when the natural love of the parent, or of the child, or of the brother, or of the sister, or of any other created thing, stands in opposition to the love of Jesus Christ, then the love of the created thing must be put down, even though it must be by the sacrifice of life itself.

This doctrine is applicable to our day also: it establishes the Christian's norm in regulating the love of kindred. And the Christian's law is that when the love of kindred stands in the way of the fulfilment of the law of God, then the kindred must be put aside. Of course, the natural feelings of the human heart will rebel against this law; but the Christian's life does not consist in the following of natural feelings and impulses, but in renunciation and self-denial.

The words of Christ recorded in the thirty-eighth verse of Matthew must have been enigmatical to the Apostles in that day. It was customary in that day that criminals going to the place of crucifixion should bear the wood on which they were to be executed. Thus Christ bore his cross up to Calvary. Now since that event, the bearing of a cross is a synonym for the endurance of suffering. Thus Christ used the expression. In vision he saw himself under the weight of the cross going to Calvary; and he makes that painful journey the exemplar of the Christian's life.

It is to be noted that Christ does not speak of merely carrying a cross, but of taking a cross. By this he teaches that

the Christian must accept his cross cheerfully and patiently. All men bear crosses: "Man that is born of woman is of few days, and full of trouble." But all men do not profit by their crosses. The effect of crosses upon some is to move them to blaspheme, to despair, to lose faith in God, and even to suicide. Evidently this is not to imitate Christ in the carrying of the cross. To fulfill the present declaration of Christ, in the first place, a man must recognize that, as Christianity was founded by the carrying of a cross and death thereon, so those who profess to follow the Crucified must imitate his life. There is a peculiar significance in the phrase, "and follow after me." It denotes that our Leader goes ahead of us bearing his cross, and we are not asked to do anything in the way of suffering that he has not done first. All Christians are not called to bear crosses of equal weight. The allotment of suffering is unequal; but all are called to bear some crosses. In the carrying of these crosses there should be no grumbling nor complaining, no shirking, no gloominess; but a glad acceptance of the will of God, and a joy to be allowed to be thus conformed to the suffering Christ.

In the next sentence Christ plays on the word *ψυχή*, *the life*. There is an elegant force in the seeming paradox which results from this word-playing. Man has two lives. He has the mortal life which begins with birth, and ends with death; and he has the other life which begins after death, and endures through eternity. Now it is the Lord's meaning that the man who makes the grand object of living the enjoyment of the present life shall lose eternal life; and conversely, he that holds his present life at little worth, and who is ready to lay it down for the cause of Christ will obtain eternal life thereby.

Strong-fixed is the love of life in the human heart. As the great bard expresses it:

"—O, our lives' sweetness!
That we the pain of death would hourly die
Rather than die at once!"

The fault lies not in the strong love of life, but in the fact that we set our misguided hearts on the few years of this life's fitful fever, and neglect an eternity of true life. But if faith

could once make the other as real as this sensible warm motion that we now possess, then we would readily transfer our deeper love from this wretched existence to the fullness of eternal life. There is no incentive to action stronger than the love of life, and this love of life often stands in the way of a good deed which has a dangerous consequence. Wherefore the Lord would make his followers fearless in the great cause of right by displacing the wrong love of life in the minds of his followers, and substituting therefor the love of that great life for which our present troubled existence is but an imperfect preparatory stage.

In two ways does eternal life transcend our present existence. First, eternal life is perfect happiness, unmixed with any pain or trouble; and, secondly, eternal life is without end. In the present life, even if we should obtain some limited and imperfect happiness, it is marred by the thought that in a few brief years, at most, we must leave it all. Wherefore he is the wise man who uses this life only as a means of possessing as much as possible of the eternal life with God.

The next sentence of Christ manifests how great is the dignity of an Apostle. The Lord Jesus had his mission from his eternal Father; and he commissioned his Apostles to go forth and preach and work in his name; and he declares to all men that the honor paid to them he considers as paid to himself, and to his Father who sent him. Men were instructed thus to see Christ in his representatives.

In founding the organization of the Church, Christ gave some to be Apostles; and some, Prophets; and some, Evangelists; and some Pastors, and Teachers. Now Jesus provided these with no worldly possessions; but he invested them with a sacredness of person, and he proclaimed to the world that any benefits done to them would be the same as though done to himself.

The sense of the forty-first verse of Matthew seems to be that whosoever extends hospitality or any act of kindness to a prophet, or to an apostle, or to any righteous follower of Christ for the specific reason of such a one's religious office or character, shall thereby be reckoned as a partaker of the merits which the righteous man thus befriended has with God,

and thus in a certain degree is taken into the class of the befriended one. There is an element of word-playing in the sentence, and its purpose is to declare how pleasing is to God an act of love done to one of God's faithful followers, and the exceeding great reward of such act. When one does such merciful act to a follower of Christ for the reason that he is a follower of Christ, the act is as though done to Christ himself, and is therefore most meritorious. The gifts of God are of such nature that the portion that each man receives is not lessened by the greater number partaking thereof. In the Kingdom of Heaven the happiness of every one is heightened by what the others receive.

Finally, Christ proceeds to a climax, and declares that any one who should give a cup of cold water to one of his little ones should not lose his reward.

In Eastern lands the heat is intense, and water is often scarce; so that to give a cup of cold water to a traveller was esteemed a kind act of hospitality. Of course, the giving of a cup of water was not attended with any expense or trouble; it might be called the least act of hospitality; but the occasions would be frequent in which such kindness could be bestowed.

We have next to determine whom the Lord designates by "these little ones." Knabenbauer believes that Christ means thereby his Apostles who are called Christ's "little flock" in Luke XII. 32. But it seems more reasonable to believe that Christ designates by the terms "these little ones," those of his followers who in the estimation of man were reputed as the least of mankind. That is to say, a cup of water given to the poorest beggar in the name of Christ would not go without its reward. To do an office of charity unto a man is always good; but that same deed acquires an additional goodness and merit if performed to one for the love of Christ, of whom the man is a disciple. In such case great is the reward of the least office done to the least disciple.

Mark and Luke record that the Apostles went forth animated by the spirit of Jesus' words, and equipped with divine power; and they preached, and cast out devils, and healed the sick.

Mark records that the Apostles “anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them.” Maldonatus, and Mariana assert that this anointing with oil was the administration of Extreme Unction.

But the common opinion rightly maintains that there is in this action of the Apostles only an adumbration of the Sacrament. Indeed the Council of Trent plainly implies as much; for it says that the Sacrament of Extreme Unction is adumbrated (*insinuat*) in the Gospel of Mark, and promulgated by James the Apostle.—*Conc. Trid. Sess. XIV. Cap. I.* Wherefore we believe that as the Lord made use of spittle and clay in some of his cures, so the Apostles made use of the anointing of oil to work these cures which were wrought not by the natural efficacy of the oil, but by the power of God. We believe, at the same time, that this anointing was a foreshadowing of the great Sacrament of Extreme Unction, which later St. James delivered to the Church.

It is plain to see that this unction was not the Sacrament; for the Apostles were not priests; the faithful were not yet baptized; and the effect of this anointing was the sure cure of bodily ills; and we know that no Sacrament primarily is intended for the benefit of the body.

MATT. XIV. 1—12.

1. Ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ ἤκουσεν Ἡρώδης ὁ τετράρχης τὴν ἀκοὴν Ἰησοῦ.

2. Καὶ εἶπεν τοῖς παισὶν αὐτοῦ: Οὗτος ἐστὶν Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτιστής, αὐτὸς ἠγέρθη ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο αἱ δυνάμεις ἐνεργοῦσιν ἐν αὐτῷ.

MARK VI. 14—29.

14. Καὶ ἤκουσεν ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἡρώδης, φανερὸν γὰρ ἐγένετο τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔλεγον, ὅτι Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτίζων ἐγγήγερται ἐκ νεκρῶν, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐνεργοῦσιν αἱ δυνάμεις ἐν αὐτῷ.

15. Ἄλλοι δὲ ἔλεγον, ὅτι Ἡλίας ἐστίν, ἄλλοι δὲ ἔλεγον, ὅτι προφήτης, ὡς εἷς ἐκ τῶν προφητῶν.

16. Ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ Ἡρώδης, ἔλεγεν: Ὁν ἐγὼ ἀπεκεφάλισα Ἰωάννην οὗτος ἠγέρθη.

3. Ὁ γὰρ Ἡρώδης κρατήσας τὸν Ἰωάννην, ἔδησεν, καὶ ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ ἀπέθετο, διὰ Ἡρωδιάδα τὴν γυναῖκα Φιλίππου τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ.

4. Ἐλεγεν γὰρ ὁ Ἰωάννης αὐτῷ, Οὐκ ἔξεστίν σε ἔχειν αὐτήν.

5. Καὶ θέλων αὐτὸν ἀποκτεῖναι, ἐφοβήθη τὸν ὄχλον, ἐπεὶ ὡς προφήτην αὐτὸν εἶχον.

6. Γενεσίοις δὲ γενομένοις τοῦ Ἡρώδου, ὠρχήσατο ἡ θυγάτηρ τῆς Ἡρωδιάδος, ἐν τῷ μέσῳ καὶ ἤρρεσεν τῷ Ἡρώδῃ.

7. Ὅθεν μεθ' ὄρκου ὡμολόγησεν αὐτῇ δοῦναι ὃ ἂν αἰτήσεται.

8. Ἡ δὲ προβιβασθεῖσα ὑπὸ τῆς μητρὸς αὐτῆς: Δός μοι, φησίν, ὧδε ἐπὶ πίνακι τὴν κεφαλὴν Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ.

17. Αὐτὸς γὰρ ὁ Ἡρώδης ἀποστείλας ἐκράτησεν τὸν Ἰωάννην, καὶ ἔδησεν αὐτὸν ἐν φυλακῇ διὰ Ἡρωδιάδα τὴν γυναῖκα Φιλίππου τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι αὐτὴν ἐγάμησεν.

18. Ἐλεγεν γὰρ ὁ Ἰωάννης τῷ Ἡρώδῃ: Ὅτι οὐκ ἔξεστίν σοι ἔχειν τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου.

19. Ἡ δὲ Ἡρωδιάς ἐνεῖχεν αὐτῷ, καὶ ᾔθελεν αὐτὸν ἀποκτεῖναι, καὶ οὐκ ἠδύνατο.

20. Ὁ γὰρ Ἡρώδης ἐφοβεῖτο τὸν Ἰωάννην, εἰδὼς αὐτὸν ἄνδρα δίκαιον καὶ ἄγιον, συνετήρει αὐτόν, καὶ ἀκούσας αὐτοῦ πολλὰ ἠπόρει, καὶ ἠδέως αὐτοῦ ᾔκουεν.

21. Καὶ γενομένης ἡμέρας εὐκαιροῦ, ὅτε Ἡρώδης τοῖς γενεσίοις αὐτοῦ δεῖπνον ἐποίησεν τοῖς μεγιστάσιν αὐτοῦ, καὶ τοῖς χιλιάρχοις, καὶ τοῖς πρώτοις τῆς Γαλιλαίας.

22. Καὶ εἰσελθούσης τῆς θυγατρὸς αὐτοῦ Ἡρωδιάδος, καὶ ὀρχησαμένης, ἤρρεσεν τῷ Ἡρώδῃ καὶ τοῖς συνανακειμένοις. Ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς εἶπεν τῷ κορασίῳ: Αἵτησόν με ὃ ἐὰν θέλῃς, καὶ δώσω σοι.

23. Καὶ ὤμοσεν αὐτῇ: Ὅ,τι ἐὰν με αἰτήσῃς δώσω σοι, ἕως ἡμῖνους τῆς βασιλείας μου.

24. Καὶ ἐξελθοῦσα, εἶπεν τῇ μητρὶ αὐτῆς: Τί αἰτήσωμαι; ἡ δὲ εἶπεν, Τὴν κεφαλὴν Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτίζοντος.

25. Καὶ εἰσελθοῦσα εὐθὺς μετὰ σπουδῆς πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα, ᾔητήσατο λέγουσα: Θέλω ἵνα ἐξ αὐτῆς ὧς μοι ἐπὶ πίνακι τὴν κεφαλὴν Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ.

9. Καὶ λυπηθεὶς ὁ βασιλεὺς, διὰ τοὺς ὄρκους καὶ τοὺς συνανακειμένους, ἐκέλευσεν δοθῆναι.

10. Καὶ πέμψας ἀπεκεφάλισεν Ἰωάννην ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ.

11. Καὶ ἠνέχθη ἡ κεφαλὴ αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ πίνακι, καὶ ἐδόθη τῷ κορασίῳ, καὶ ἤνεγκεν τῇ μητρὶ αὐτῆς.

12. Καὶ προσελθόντες οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἦραν τὸ πτῶμα, καὶ ἔθαψαν αὐτόν, καὶ ἐλθόντες ἀπήγγειλαν τῷ Ἰησοῦ.

26. Καὶ περιλύπος γενόμενος ὁ βασιλεὺς, διὰ τοὺς ὄρκους καὶ τοὺς ἀνακειμένους οὐκ ᾔθέλησεν ἀθετῆσαι αὐτήν.

27. Καὶ εὐθὺς ἀποστείλας ὁ βασιλεὺς σπεκουλάτορα, ἐπέταξεν ἐνέγκαι τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ.

28. Καὶ ἀπελθὼν ἀπεκεφάλισεν αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ, καὶ ἤνεγκεν τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ πίνακι, καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτὴν τῷ κορασίῳ, καὶ τὸ κοράσιον ἔδωκεν αὐτὴν τῇ μητρὶ αὐτῆς.

29. Καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, ἦλθαν, καὶ ἦραν τὸ πτῶμα αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔθηκαν αὐτὸ ἐν τῷ μνημείῳ.

14. And king Herod heard thereof; for his name had become known, and he said: John the Baptist is risen from the dead, and therefore do these powers work in him.

15. But others said: It is Eliah. And others said: It is a prophet, even as one of the prophets.

1. At that season Herod the tetrarch heard the report concerning Jesus,

2. And said unto his servants: This is John the Baptist; he is risen from the dead; and therefore do these powers work in him.

3. For Herod had laid hold on John, and bound him, and put him in prison for the sake of Herodias, his brother Philip's wife.

16. But Herod, when he heard thereof, said: John, whom I beheaded, he is risen.

17. For Herod himself had sent forth and laid hold upon John, and bound him in prison for the sake of Herodias, his brother Philip's wife: for he had married her

4. For John said unto him:
It is not lawful for thee to
have her.

5. And when he would
have put him to death, he
feared the multitude, because
they counted him as a prophet.

6. But when Herod's birth-
day came, the daughter of
Herodias danced in the midst,
and pleased Herod.

7. Whereupon he promised
with an oath to give her what-
soever she would ask.

8. And she, being put for-
ward by her mother, saith:
Give me here in a charger the
head of John the Baptist.

9. And the king was
grieved; but for the sake of

18. For John said unto
Herod: It is not lawful for
thee to have thy brother's
wife.

19. And Herodias set her-
self against him, and desired
to kill him; but she could not.

20. For Herod feared John,
knowing that he was a right-
eous and a holy man, and kept
him safe. And when he heard
him, he was much perplexed;
and he heard him gladly

21. And when a convenient
day was come, that Herod on
his birthday made a supper to
his lords, and the high captains
and the chief men of Galilee;

22. And when the daughter
of Herodias herself came in
and danced, she pleased Herod
and them that sat at meat with
him; and the king said unto
the damsel: Ask of me what-
soever thou wilt, and I will
give it thee.

23. And he swore unto her:
Whatsoever thou shalt ask of
me, I will give it thee, unto
the half of my kingdom.

24. And she went out, and
said unto her mother: What
shall I ask? And she said:
The head of John the Baptist.

25. And she came in
straightway with haste unto
the king, and asked, saying:
I will that thou forthwith give
me in a charger the head of
John the Baptist.

26. And the king was ex-
ceeding sorry; but for the sake

his oaths, and of them who sat at meat with him, he commanded it to be given.

10. And he sent and beheaded John in the prison.

11. And his head was brought in a charger, and given to the damsel; and she brought it to her mother.

12. And his disciples came, and took up the corpse and buried him; and they went and told Jesus.

of his oaths, and of them that sat at meat, he would not reject her.

27. And straightway the king sent forth a soldier of his guard, and commanded to bring his head: and he went and beheaded him in the prison,

28. And brought his head in a charger, and gave it to the damsel; and the damsel gave it to her mother.

29. And when his disciples heard thereof, they came and took up his corpse, and laid it in a tomb.

LUKE IX. 7-9:

7. Now Herod the tetrarch heard of all that was done: and he was much perplexed, because that it was said by some, that John was risen from the dead;

8. And by some, that Eliah had appeared; and by others, that one of the old prophets was risen again.

9. And Herod said: John I beheaded: but who is this, about whom I hear such things? And he sought to see him.

7. "Ηκουσεν δὲ Ἡρώδης ὁ τετράρχης τὰ γινόμενα πάντα, καὶ διηπόρει; διὰ τὸ λέγεσθαι ὑπὸ τινων, ὅτι Ἰωάννης ἡγήρεθι ἐκ νεκρῶν,

8. Ὑπὸ τινων δὲ, ὅτι Ἠλίας ἐφάνη, ἄλλων δὲ, ὅτι προφήτης τις τῶν ἀρχαίων ἀνέστη.

9. Εἶπεν δὲ ὁ Ἡρώδης: Ἰωάννην ἐγὼ ἀπεκεφάλισα: τίς δὲ ἐστὶν οὗτος, περὶ οὗ ἀκούω τοιαῦτα; καὶ ἐζήτει ἰδεῖν αὐτόν.

In the third verse of Matthew the term *Φιλιππου* is omitted by D, and by the Vulgate, but all the other authorities are unanimous for its presence. In Verse nine, B and D have *λυπηθείς*, and this is favored by Tischendorf, Westcott, and Hort. The other codices have *ἐλυπήθη διὰ δὲ τούς*, κτλ. In Verse twelve the reading *πτῶμα* is found in *Σ*, B, C, D, and L; and this is endorsed by Tischendorf, Westcott, and Hort. The other authorities have *σῶμα*. In the same verse

ℵ*, B, Tischendorf, Westcott, and Hort support the reading *αὐτόν*: other authorities favor *αὐτό*.

In the fourteenth verse of Mark, B and D have *ἔλεγον*: the other authorities have *ἔλεγεν*. In the sixteenth verse *ἡγέρθη* without any addition stands in ℵ, B, L, Δ, 33, 102; and this reading is followed by the Coptic, the Jerusalem Syriac, and recently by the Revised Edition of the protestant Bible. The reading *ἡγέρθη ἐκ νεκρῶν* is found in A, D, Π, et al., and this reading is followed by the Vulgate, Gothic, Peshitto Syriac, Philoxenian Syriac, Armenian and Ethiopian versions. In Verse twenty we find *ἡπόρει*, which is endorsed by Tischendorf, Westcott, and Hort. *Ἐποίει* is found in A, C, D, Δ, Π, and in the versions. In Verse twenty-two the reading *θυγατὸς αὐτοῦ* occurs in ℵ, B, D, L, Δ and 238: this reading is endorsed by Westcott and Hort. But it is certain that for *αὐτοῦ* we should read *αὐτῆς*, for this daughter was not begotten of Herodias by Antipas, but by her husband Philip. In Verse twenty-four *αἰτήσωμαι* is found in ℵ, B, A, C, D, G, L and Δ: other authorities have *αἰτήσομαι*.

In the eighth verse of Luke *προφήτης τις* is found ℵ, B, C, L, X, Z, et al., other authorities have *προφήτης εἷς*.

The fame of Jesus at this time had spread through Galilee; for within that province he had wrought many miracles. Reports of his wonderful works are brought to Herod Antipas the Tetrarch, and that ruler is straightway troubled in mind on account of his blood-guiltiness in having slain John the Baptist. Mark is inaccurate in calling this man a king. His father had been a king; but the Romans took away from his successors the title, and made them tetrarchs. Mark uses the term king in a general sense to denote a ruler.

There is some difficulty in reconciling the three synoptists in their accounts of Herod's reflections concerning the fame of Jesus. According to Luke some of Herod's counsellors declare that the great worker of miracles in Galilee is John the Baptist risen from the dead; others, that he is Eliah; others that he is one of the old prophets; while Herod himself is perplexed in mind, and can not determine who he is. But, according to Matthew and Mark, Herod himself positively states that John the Baptist is risen from the dead.

There is no disagreement here; but the synoptists relate different stages of the thoughts of Herod's mind. It seems that the affair must have progressed in this manner. Herod and his courtiers hear of the great Prophet of Galilee, and immediately Herod is filled with terror from his consciousness of guilt. The expression of his perplexity and doubt is recorded by Luke. Herod takes council with his advisers; and their various opinions are recorded by Mark and Luke. But Herod is filled with a great fear, and gives expression to his fear in declaring that John the Baptist has arisen. His statement is not a clear certain declaration of a known truth; but an expression of what he greatly fears. He therefore endeavors, as Luke says, to see Jesus, to be certified whether or not he be John the Baptist; but Jesus knowing the unworthiness of Herod's motives, withdrew from him, and went out into a desert place.

It may seem at first thought surprising that it is only at this point in the life of Jesus that Herod heard of his fame. But we must know that this Herod was a sensual man, who cared little for anything that did not affect his personal pleasure. He most probably had heard something of a prophet who was operating in Galilee, but he had cared nothing for the report. The most of Jesus' miracles had been among the common people, and Herod took small interest in the people. The reason why he takes heed of the fame of Jesus now is the fact that he is haunted by the remembrance of his most foul murder of a man of whose sanctity he was well aware.

In the ninth verse of the present text of Matthew Herod is called king. As we explained above regarding the text of Mark, this is a loose general application of any ruler.

After the Baptist's fearless denunciation, Herod threw John into prison. Moved by Herodias, Herod would have slain John outright, but he feared the people. It was only the instigation of Herodias that set Herod against John. Herod himself, as Mark assures us, heard John gladly, even after his imprisonment. Hearing him, he was convinced that John was a righteous man; and hearing John, Herod was much perplexed over his own life of crime and shame.

Moreover, Herod feared that the people would rise up in sedition, if he slew John, and that he might be accused at Rome. It is probable that this latter consideration was far more potent with Herod than the voice of conscience.

But Herodias watched her chance to take off the man who had dared to denounce her adulterous union.

On a certain birthday festivity, while Herod was banqueting with his lords, military tribunes, and chief men, Salome the daughter of Herodias came into the banquet hall, and danced before the guests. This act was an evidence that the girl wished to honor greatly the day, and it pleased Herod. It moved his lust, now inflamed by wine; for the dance on such occasions was of the most lascivious kind. It appealed to his vanity; for the dancing girl had excited the admiration of his guests. Moved by these low carnal motives, and inflamed by wine and lust, he bids the damsel ask anything, even though it be the half of his kingdom.

This was a sort of idiom among Oriental people to express a willingness to grant any request. Ahasuerus used the same expression to Esther.

Herod confirms his promise by an oath. Both the offer and the oath were unreasonable and wicked. A king binds himself by oath to give any request to a dancing girl. Reason had been displaced in the ruler by wine and lust. The dancer withdraws and consults her mother. Behold now the power of a woman's hate. This daughter could have obtained at that moment any request in the power of Herod to give. It was a propitious moment to advance herself in power and possessions; but that woman prefers to slake her thirst for revenge in the blood of John the Baptist than to have the half of a kingdom. Truly it is said in Ecclesiasticus XXV.23: "And there is no anger above the anger of a woman." And again: "All malice is small in comparison to the malice of a woman."—Ibid. 26.

St. Mark is careful to note that the daughter came back in haste, after having received the instructions of her mother. The daughter's line of action was entirely regulated by the counsel of her mother. The haste signifies that Herodias is afraid that Herod may change his mind, or that something

may occur to frustrate her bloodthirsty design. She knows that Herod is acting under the influence of motives which cannot endure. In the heat of wine and sensuality Herod will consider that his honor will be compromised before his guests if he grant not the infamous demand. This Herodias well knows. Unless the deed be done quickly, Herod may repent of his rash promise. And so the damsel comes quickly, and before all the guests, demands that the head of John the Baptist be given her in a dish.

Such monstrous cruelty has no parallel in history. Wicked women have desired the death of those they hated, and have compassed their deaths; but what woman ever asked that the head of her victim might be brought to her as a viand upon a plate?

And now Herod is sorely distressed in mind. His knowledge of John's holy life, and his fear of the people were both strong against the deed. But he had taken an oath to give the damsel whatever she asked; and the eyes of all his guests were upon him; and shame prompted him to maintain his promise. Of course, no man would be bound to keep such a wicked oath; but it was not the fear of God that made his oath sacred, but human respect, that otherwise he would be shamed before all the guests. What a disgrace to humanity that in that whole assembly there was not found a man to stand up, and plead with the tetrarch to spare the life of an innocent and holy man, who was to be slain to gratify the whim of a dancing girl!

And Herod, though exceedingly sorry, gave commandment to one of his guards to go and behead John in his prison, and bring his head to the damsel. The deed was done; the head was brought and given to the daughter, who gave it to her mother. And the disciples came and buried the body of their master. History has not even preserved the memory of his tomb; and though there are many legends in tradition, nothing certain is known thereof. The beheading was done without any process of law; and it was done secretly, to avoid a popular uprising against it. Thus ended the glorious life of the Precursor of Jesus Christ. Sublime was the office entrusted to John, and sublimely did he fulfill it. He spent

his life in spreading the knowledge of righteousness among men; he died in the defense of right. What a consolation it is to know that there is a realm where the false judgments of the world are reversed! where virtue triumphs and receives her just reward! In Herod's day, men who judge according to the world's views might have said that the Baptist had failed, and that Herodias had triumphed. To-day John is a saint in Heaven; his memory is honored among men; throughout the whole earth men look up to him, and ask his intercession with God; while the memory of Herod and his wicked paramour is accursed; and men pronounce their names with horror and execration. Thus it is ever with right and wrong. Wrong may prevail for a time; it often does here on earth, but its success is measured by years and must end. But truth, though crushed to earth, shall rise again; she is immortal; she must finally prevail; and her victory shall endure forever.

The existence of the eternal life of the elect in Heaven explains why God allows his saints to suffer the unjust oppressor's wrong here on earth. John the Baptist was one of the most faithful of all God's chosen ones. He is a hero among saints. He is to be struck down, because he defended the cause of right against an incestuous ruler. Even among the demons of hell we could scarce conceive a more horrid plot than that concocted and carried out by Herodias. The order of death is given by the besotted adulterer; the murderers hasten to the prison; they murder the man of God, and carry his head to the monster Herodias. No angel of God appears to defend the righteous man; God allows wickedness to have its course. It is like that day when the Son of God was dragged to Calvary and crucified, and his enemies challenged God to put forth his power in Jesus' defense. And God was silent, and allowed to the power of darkness its hour. It is all explained by the great truth of eternity. God is patient and longsuffering because he is eternal; and as he has prepared eternal happiness for his elect, he may well allow them to endure the purifying sufferings of this life. And with this great hope should we meet sorrow which comes to our lot here on earth. Leave it to God to determine

how he wishes us to serve him. What we receive here is not the measure of God's love. Temporal things are hardly worth the asking. We should rather ask for faith for that is the basis of all our spiritual life. We should ask for God's grace, and his love, for these are eternal, and by them we achieve those results which are the sole possession which we shall carry out of this life.

MATT. XIV. 13—21.

13. Ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ἀνεχώρησεν ἐκεῖθεν ἐν πλοίῳ εἰς ἔρημον τόπον κατ' ἰδίαν, καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ ὄχλοι, ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ περὶ ἀπὸ τῶν πόλεων.

14. Καὶ ἐξελθὼν εἶδεν πολὺν ὄχλον, καὶ ἐσπλαγχνίσθη ἐπ' αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἐθεράπευσεν τοὺς ἀρρώστους αὐτῶν.

15. Ὁψίας δὲ γενομένης, προσῆλθαν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ λέγοντες: Ἐρημός ἐστιν ὁ τόπος, καὶ ἡ ὥρα ἤδη παρήλθεν, ἀπόλυσον τοὺς ὄχλους, ἵνα ἀπελθόντες εἰς τὰς κώμας, ἀγοράσωσιν ἑαυτοῖς βρώματα.

16. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς: Οὐ χρεῖαν ἔχουσιν ἀπελθεῖν, δότε αὐτοῖς ὑμεῖς φαγεῖν.

MARK VI. 30—44.

30. Καὶ συνάγονται οἱ ἀπόστολοι πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν, καὶ ἀπήγγειλαν αὐτῷ πάντα ὅσα ἐποίησαν, καὶ ὅσα ἐδίδαξαν.

31. Καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς: Δεῦτε ὑμεῖς αὐτοὶ κατ' ἰδίαν εἰς ἔρημον τόπον, καὶ ἀναπαύσασθε ὀλίγον, ἦσαν γὰρ οἱ ἐρχόμενοι καὶ οἱ ὑπάγοντες πολλοί, καὶ οὐδὲ φαγεῖν εὐκαίρουν.

32. Καὶ ἀπῆλθον ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ εἰς ἔρημον τόπον κατ' ἰδίαν.

33. Καὶ εἶδον αὐτοὺς ὑπάγοντας καὶ ἐπέγνωσαν πολλοί, καὶ περὶ ἀπὸ πασῶν τῶν πόλεων συνέδραμον ἐκεῖ, καὶ προῆλθον αὐτούς.

34. Καὶ ἐξελθὼν εἶδεν πολὺν ὄχλον, καὶ ἐσπλαγχνίσθη ἐπ' αὐτούς, ὅτι ἦσαν ὡς πρόβατα μὴ ἔχοντα ποιμένα, καὶ ἤρξατο διδάσκειν αὐτοὺς πολλά.

35. Καὶ ἤδη ὥρας πολλῆς γενομένης, προσελθόντες αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, ἔλεγον, ὅτι ἔρημός ἐστιν ὁ τόπος, καὶ ἡ ὥρα πολλή.

36. Ἀπόλυσον αὐτούς, ἵνα ἀπελθόντες εἰς τοὺς κύκλῳ ἀγροὺς καὶ κώμας, ἀγοράσωσιν ἑαυτοῖς τι φάγωσιν.

37. Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς: Δότε αὐτοῖς ὑμεῖς φαγεῖν, καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ: Ἀπελθόντες ἀγοράσωμεν δηναρίων διακοσίων ἄρτους καὶ δώσωμεν αὐτοῖς φαγεῖν.

17. Οἱ δὲ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ: Οὐκ ἔχομεν ὧδε εἰ μὴ πέντε ἄρτους καὶ δύο ἰχθύας.

18. Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν, φέρετέ μοι ὧδε αὐτούς.

19. Καὶ κελεύσας τοὺς ὄχλους ἀνακλιθῆναι ἐπὶ τοῦ χόρτου, λαβὼν τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους, καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας, ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, εὐλόγησεν, καὶ κλάσας ἔδωκεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς τοὺς ἄρτους, οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ τοῖς ὄχλοις.

20. Καὶ ἔφαγον πάντες, καὶ ἐχορτάσθησαν, καὶ ἦραν τὸ περισσεῦον τῶν κλασμάτων, δώδεκα κοφίνους πλήρεις.

21. Οἱ δὲ ἐσθίοντες ἦσαν ἄνδρες ὡσεὶ πενακισχίλιοι, χωρὶς γυναικῶν καὶ παιδίων.

30. And the Apostles gather themselves together unto Jesus; and they told him all things whatsoever they had done, and whatsoever they had taught.

31. And he saith unto them: Come ye yourselves apart into a desert place, and rest a while. For there were many coming and going, and they had no leisure so much as to eat.

38. Ὁ δὲ λέγει αὐτοῖς: Πόσους ἔχετε ἄρτους; ὑπάγετε, ἴδετε. Καὶ γνόντες, λέγουσιν: Πέντε καὶ δύο ἰχθύας.

39. Καὶ ἐπέταξεν αὐτοῖς ἀνακλιθῆναι πάντας, συμπόσια συμπόσια ἐν τῷ χλωρῷ χόρτῳ.

40. Καὶ ἀνέπεσαν πρασιαὶ πρασιαὶ, κατὰ ἑκατὸν καὶ κατὰ πεντήκοντα.

41. Καὶ λαβὼν τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας, ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, εὐλόγησεν, καὶ κατέκλασεν τοὺς ἄρτους, καὶ ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἵνα παρατιθῶσιν αὐτοῖς, καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας ἐμέρισεν πᾶσιν.

42. Καὶ ἔφαγον πάντες, καὶ ἐχορτάσθησαν.

43. Καὶ ἦραν κλάσματα δώδεκα κοφίνων πληρώματα, καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἰχθύων.

44. Καὶ ἦσαν οἱ φαγόντες τοὺς ἄρτους, πενακισχίλιοι ἄνδρες.

13. Now when Jesus heard it, he withdrew from thence in a boat, to a desert place apart: and when the multitudes heard thereof, they followed him on foot from the cities.

14. And he came forth, and saw a great multitude, and he had compassion on them, and healed their sick.

15. And when even was come, the disciples came to him, saying: The place is desert, and the time is already past; send the multitudes away, that they may go into the villages, and buy themselves food.

16. But Jesus said unto them: They have no need to go away; give ye them to eat.

17. And they say unto him: We have here but five loaves, and two fishes.

18. And he said: Bring them hither to me.

19. And he commanded the multitudes to sit down on the grass; and he took the five loaves, and the two fishes, and looking up to Heaven, he blessed, and brake and gave the loaves to the disciples, and

32. And they went away in the boat to a desert place apart.

33. And the people saw them going, and many knew, and they ran there together on foot from all the cities, and outwent them.

34. And he came forth and saw a great multitude, and he had compassion on them, because they were as sheep not having a shepherd: and he began to teach them many things.

35. And when the day was now far spent, his disciples came unto him, and said: The place is desert, and the day is far spent:

36. Send them away, that they may go into the country and villages round about, and buy themselves somewhat to eat.

37. But he answered and said unto them: Give ye them to eat. And they say unto him: Shall we go and buy two hundred pennyworth of bread, and give them to eat?

38. And he saith unto them: How many loaves have ye? Go and see. And when they knew, they say: Five, and two fishes.

39. And he commanded them that all should sit down by companies upon the green grass.

40. And they sat down in ranks, by hundreds, and by fifties.

the disciples gave to the multitudes.

20. And they did all eat, and were filled: and they took up that which remained over of the broken pieces, twelve baskets full.

21. And they that did eat were about five thousand men, beside women and children.

LUKE IX. 10—17.

10. Καὶ ὑποστρέψαντες οἱ ἀπόστολοι διηγήσαντο αὐτῷ ὅσα ἐποίησαν, καὶ παραλαβὼν αὐτοὺς, ὑπεχώρησεν κατ' ἰδίαν εἰς πόλιν καλουμένην Βηθσαϊδᾶ.

11. Οἱ δὲ ὄχλοι γινόντες, ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ, καὶ ἀποδεξάμενος αὐτοὺς, ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ τοὺς χρεῖαν ἔχοντας θεραπέας, ἰᾶτο.

12. Ἡ δὲ ἡμέρα ἤρξατο κλίνειν, προσελθόντες δὲ οἱ δώδεκα, εἶπον αὐτῷ: Ἀπόλυσον τὸν ὄχλον, ἵνα πορευθέντες εἰς τὰς κύκλῳ κώμας καὶ ἀγροὺς, καταλύσωσιν, καὶ εὐρωσιν ἐπισιτισμόν, ὅτι ὥδε ἐν ἐρήμῳ τόπῳ ἐσμέν.

41. And he took the five loaves and the two fishes, and looking up to Heaven, he blessed, and brake the loaves; and he gave to the disciples to set before them; and the two fishes he divided among them all.

42. And they did all eat, and were filled.

43. And they took up broken pieces, twelve basketfuls, and also of the fishes.

44. And they that ate the loaves were five thousand men.

JOHN VI. 1—13.

1. Μετὰ ταῦτα ἀπῆλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης τῆς Γαλιλαίας τῆς Τιβεριάδος.

2. Ἠκολούθει δὲ αὐτῷ ὄχλος πολὺς, ὅτι ἐθεώρουν τὰ σημεῖα ἃ ἐποίει ἐπὶ τῶν ἀσθενούντων.

3. Ἀνῆλθεν δὲ εἰς τὸ ὄρος ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἐκεῖ ἐκάθητο μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ.

4. Ἦν δὲ ἐγγὺς τὸ πάσχα, ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων.

5. Ἐπάρας οὖν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ θεασάμενος ὅτι πολὺς ὄχλος ἔρχεται πρὸς αὐτόν, λέγει πρὸς Φίλιππον: Πόθεν ἀγοράσωμεν ἄρτους, ἵνα φάγωσιν οὗτοι;

6. Τοῦτο δὲ ἔλεγεν πειράζων αὐτόν: αὐτὸς γὰρ ᾔδει τι ἔμελλεν ποιεῖν.

13. Εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτούς: Δότε αὐτοῖς φαγεῖν ὑμεῖς: οἱ δὲ εἶπαν: Οὐκ εἰσὶν ἡμῖν πλεῖον ἢ ἄρτοι πέντε καὶ ἰχθύες δύο, εἰ μή τι πορευθέντες ἡμεῖς ἀγοράσωμεν εἰς πάντα τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον βρώματα.

14. Ἦσαν γὰρ ὥσει ἄνδρες πεντακισχίλιοι. Εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ: Κατακλείνατε αὐτοὺς κλισίας ὥσει ἀνὰ πεντήκοντα.

15. Καὶ ἐποίησαν οὕτως, καὶ κατέκλιναν ἅπαντας.

16. Λαβὼν δὲ τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, εὐλόγησεν αὐτούς, καὶ κατέκλασεν, καὶ ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς παραθεῖναι τῷ ὄχλῳ.

17. Καὶ ἔφαγον, καὶ ἐχορτάσθησαν πάντες, καὶ ἦρθη τὸ περισσεύσαν αὐτοῖς κλασμάτων, κόφινοι δώδεκα.

10. And the Apostles, when they were returned, declared unto him what things they had done. And he took them, and withdrew apart to a city called Bethsaida.

11. But the multitudes perceiving it followed him: and he welcomed them, and spoke to them of the kingdom of

7. Ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ Φίλιππος: Διακοσίων δηναρίων ἄρτοι οὐκ ἀρκοῦσιν αὐτοῖς ἵνα ἕκαστος βραχὺ λάβῃ.

8. Λέγει αὐτῷ εἰς ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ, Ἀνδρέας ὁ ἀδελφὸς Σίμωνος Πέτρου.

9. Ἔστιν παιδάριον ὧδε, δς ἔχει πέντε ἄρτους κριθίνους καὶ δύο ὀψάρια, ἀλλὰ ταῦτα τί ἐστὶν εἰς τοσούτους;

10. Εἶπεν δὲ Ἰησοῦς: Ποιήσατε τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἀναπεσεῖν: ἦν δὲ χόρτος πολὺς ἐν τῷ τόπῳ: ἀνέπεσαν οὖν οἱ ἄνδρες τὸν ἀριθμὸν ὡς πεντακισχίλιοι.

11. Ἐλαβεν οὖν τοὺς ἄρτους ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ εὐχαριστήσας διέδωκεν τοῖς ἀνακειμένοις, ὁμοίως καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὀπαρίων ὅσον ἤθελον.

12. Ὡς δὲ ἐνεπλήσθησαν, λέγει τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ: Συναγάγετε τὰ περισσεύσαντα κλάσματα, ἵνα μὴ τι ἀπόληται.

13. Συνήγαγον οὖν, καὶ ἐγέμισαν δώδεκα κοφίνους κλασμάτων ἐκ τῶν πέντε ἄρτων τῶν κριθίνων, ἃ ἐπερίσσευσαν τοῖς βεβρωκόσι.

1. After these things Jesus went away to the other side of the sea of Galilee, which is the sea of Tiberias.

2. And a great multitude followed him, because they beheld the signs which he did on them that were sick.

God, and them that had need of healing be healed.

12. And the day began to wear away; and the twelve came, and said unto him: Send the multitude away, that they may go into the villages and country round about, and lodge, and get victuals: for we are here in a desert place.

13. But he said unto them: Give ye them to eat. And they said: We have no more than five loaves and two fishes; except we should go and buy food for all this people.

14. For they were about five thousand men. And he said unto his disciples: Make them sit down in companies, about fifty each.

15. And they did so, and made them all sit down.

16. And he took the five loaves and the two fishes, and looking up to Heaven, he blessed them, and broke; and gave to the disciples to set before the multitude.

3. And Jesus went up into the mountain, and there he sat with his disciples.

4. Now the passover, the feast of the Jews, was at hand.

5. Jesus therefore lifting up his eyes, and seeing that a great multitude cometh unto him, saith unto Philip: Whence are we to buy bread, that these may eat?

6. And this he said to prove him: for he himself knew what he would do.

7. Philip answered him: Two hundred pennyworth of bread is not sufficient for them, that every one may take a little.

8. One of his disciples, Andrew, Simon Peter's brother, saith unto him:

9. There is a lad here, who hath five barley loaves, and two fishes: but what are these among so many?

10. Jesus said: Make the people sit down. Now there was much grass in the place. So the men sat down, in number about five thousand.

11. Jesus therefore took the loaves; and having given thanks, he distributed to them that were set down; likewise also of the fishes as much as they would.

17. And they did eat, and were all filled: and there was taken up that which remained over to them of broken pieces, twelve baskets.

12. And when they were filled, he saith unto his disciples: Gather up the broken pieces which remain over, that nothing be lost.

13. So they gathered them up, and filled twelve baskets with broken pieces from the five barley loaves, which remained over unto them that had eaten.

In Verse thirteen of the text of Matthew \aleph , L, Z, et al., have *πεζοί*, which reading is followed by the Vulgate. Other authorities have *πεζῶν*. In Verse fifteen, \aleph , C, Z, Origen, Tischendorf and the Coptic version insert *οὖν* after *ἀπόλυσον*.

In the thirty-third verse of the text of Mark *αὐτούς* is placed as the object of *ἐπέγνωσαν* in \aleph , A, K, L, M, U, Δ , Π , et al. This reading is followed by the Coptic, Syriac, and Ethiopian versions, and by Tischendorf. E, F, G, H, S, V, Γ , et al., have *αὐτόν*. B and C, and the Vulgate omit the object. At the end of the same verse the clause *καὶ συνῆλθον πρὸς αὐτόν* is found in A, Γ , Π , and several other codices. In Verse thirty-nine *ἀνακλίνει* is the reading of A, B², D, L, Γ , Δ , Π and Origen and Tischendorf. \aleph , B*, G, and Westcott and Hort have *ἀνακλιθῆναι*. In the forty-third verse A, D, Γ , Π and many other uncial codices have *κοφίνων πλήρεις*. \aleph , B, L, and Δ , have *κοφίνων πληρώματα*.

In the tenth verse of Luke \aleph^{ac} , B, L, X, Z, the Bohairic and Coptic versions, and Tischendorf, Westcott, and Hort support the reading which we give in the text *πόλιν καλουμένην*. Other authorities have *τόπον ἔρημον πόλεως κτλ.* The codex \aleph has the singular reading "near Tiberias." This is evidently an interpolation.

In the second member of the fourteenth verse, \aleph , B, C, D, L, R, Z, Origen, Westcott and Hort, and the Sahidic version have *ὥσεὶ ἀνά*.

It is quite probable that the preaching and miracle-working of the twelve Apostles on their first mission aroused Herod to the importance of the great religious movement in

Galilee, and he therefore determined to see the great Prophet. Knowing Herod's designs, as soon as the disciples returned, Jesus invited them to go over the sea to Galilee into a desert place to rest. The Apostles had labored much and so many had claimed their attention that they had not the time to take food.

St. Luke tells us that the place whither Jesus and the Apostles withdrew was Bethsaida. It is evident that this can not be the Bethsaida near Capharnaum, since John positively asserts that Jesus and the twelve crossed the lake. Moreover Mark, relates that, after the event here recorded, they crossed the lake back to Bethsaida.

Weiss has declared that the designation of the place is an error in Luke.

The identification of the site of Bethsaida is one of the most difficult questions of Palestinography. It is designated by John as the native village of Peter, Andrew and Philip, and as these were Galileans, at least one Bethsaida must have been in Galilee.

Josephus tells us that Philip the Tetrarch advanced the village Bethsaida at the Lake of Gennesaret, to the dignity of a city, and called it Julias, the same name with Caesar's daughter.—*Antiq. XVIII. II. 1.* In the "Wars of the Jews," *III. X. 7*, Josephus declares that Julias was on the river Jordan near its mouth; and *ibidem II. IX. 1*, he states that Julias was in Lower Gaulanitis. Hence we understand that Bethsaida-Julias was a city situated on the Oriental side of the Jordan, where it empties into Lake Gennesaret, in the territory of Gaulanitis. Lightfoot, Seetzen, Kiepert, Socin, and Schumacher believe that there is but one Bethsaida. Their greatest argument is that, if there were two, the Evangelists would have added some distinctive appellation to distinguish them in speaking of them. But this argument is weak; for John, *XII. 21*, does explicitly mention the Bethsaida of Galilee, and Galilee never extended beyond the Jordan into Gaulanitis. G. A. Smith [*Geog. of Holy Land*] argues for one Bethsaida. To meet the argument that Bethsaida must be in Galilee, he declares that Galilee ran right around the lake, and included most of the level coast on the east.

This statement is unsupported by proofs. All authorities are concordant in assigning as the eastern boundaries of Galilee the waters of Merom [Lake Huleh], the river Jordan, and the Sea of Galilee. It is true that Josephus speaks of Judas of Gamala now as a Gaulonite [Antiq. XVIII. I. 1.] and again as a Galilean XVIII. I. 6; but yet Josephus in "Wars of the Jews," XX. 6, clearly distinguishes Gamala of Gaulanitis from Galilee. Moreover Philip the tetrarch would not fortify a city which was situate in Galilee in Herod Antipas' jurisdiction.

Hence we believe with Munk, Robinson, Stanley, Tristram, Victor Guerin, Reland, Quaresimus and Riehm that Julias was on the Oriental bank of the mouth of the Jordan; that it was distinct from Bethsaida of Galilee, which was on the west shore on the Lake of Gennesaret, near to Capharnaum.

It seems also that an incontestable proof for the existence of Bethsaida on the western bank of the Lake of Gennesaret can be drawn from the four Gospels. Certain it is that the Lord was in the country round about Capharnaum, when the Apostles returned from their first mission; certain it is according to St. John that they crossed the lake to arrive at a place of retirement; certain it is, according to Mark, Luke, and John, that, after this first multiplication of the loaves, Jesus and the twelve crossed the lake, and came, according to Mark, to Bethsaida; according to Matthew, to Gennesaret; according to John, to Capharnaum. The only reasonable explanation of this is that the land of Gennesaret was the general name of the land bordering on the lake on the west coast, and that Capharnaum and Bethsaida were close together in that same land.

Seetzen, Smith, Robinson and others have identified Julias on the eastern side of the lake with et-Thell, a large village about a mile and a half north of Gennesaret, and about three quarters of a mile east of the upper Jordan. Josephus sometimes declares that Bethsaida was on the Jordan, and again he locates it on the lake. It must have been therefore on the Jordan close to the point where it empties into the Sea of Galilee. The only evidence in favor of et-Thell is the extensive ruins found there; but it seems too far removed from the lake.

The very name Bethsaida, *house of fish*, indicates a city close to the lake. Hence *Ms'aidieh* or *Umm S'aidieh* has been proposed as a more probable site. *Ms'aidieh* could easily be derived from Bethsaida. It is close to the northeastern shore of the lake at the edge of the fertile plain *el-Batihah*. The most probable site of Bethsaida on the western shore of the Sea of Galilee is Tabighah. See *A Diary of My Life in the Holy Land*.

Since the existence of Bethsaida-Julias, on the northeastern shore of the lake is so well proven, the statement of Luke, IX. 10, is explained. They disembarked near this city, and then withdrew into a desert place back of the city.

It is somewhat singular that after the feeding of the multitudes, Mark, VI. 45, declares that Jesus sent his disciples across the sea to Bethsaida. As the existence of the two Bethsaidas is proven, such a coincidence is possible. But we must know also that the original text of Mark will suffer another construction. The Greek text is, εἰς τὸ πέραν πρὸς Βηθσαιδάν. This could be rendered "to the other side opposite to Bethsaida," In fact many of the codices of the old Latin Version have a *Bethsaida*. Therefore, though some of the details are obscure, there is no ground to charge the Evangelists with inaccuracy.

We are informed by Matthew, and especially by Mark, that, when the people heard that Jesus and his disciples were about to withdraw to a desert place, a great multitude from the various cities set out for the place whither they knew Jesus to be going. The multitude went on foot, and arrived at the place before the arrival of the Lord and his Apostles. Hence we must contemplate such a voyage across the lake, that the land journey between the two termini would not be largely in excess of the voyage by sea. Now the northern shore of the Lake of Tiberias is of such contour that they who go by the land from the neighborhood of Capharnaum around the northern shore of the Lake of Gennesaret, to the hilly country lying at its northeastern angle, would have but little more distance to go than they who go by water. Those who journey on foot would have to cross the upper Jordan; but we know that it is fordable in many points. Wherefore it seems that Jesus and

the twelve directed their course in direction northeast across the Lake of Gennesaret to the hilly country on its northeastern shore. The people saw their departure, and set out in a vast multitude on foot for the other side of the lake. As the vast throngs moved onward in great haste, they received large accessions from all the villages bordering on the northern shore of the lake, until the number of the multitude was about five thousand besides women and children.

The expression of Mark, "they ran there together on foot from all the cities, and outwent them," indicates that the crowds journeyed with great haste. The reason of the haste is obvious. The report had circulated among the people, that the Christ was about to withdraw from the people into a desert place, and they feared that, if Jesus and his Apostles first reached land, they would hide themselves in some part of the desert. The multitudes therefore made haste, and succeeded in reaching the other side, before those in the boat came to land.

After a period of preaching and working so active that time was not afforded for the taking of food, Jesus invited his Apostles to come into a secluded place for some rest and time for reflection. The apostolic body therefore set out across the lake for that purpose, and the thirteenth verse of Matthew simply expresses this design, and the setting out to accomplish it.

When Jesus comes forth out of the boat on the northeastern shore of the lake he finds the multitudes awaiting him. This following of the people was a certain degree of faith; crude and imperfect, but still it was a beginning. Our Lord was pleased with the act of the multitudes, and being filled with compassion of them, he withdrew up into the mountain, and the multitudes followed him. There Jesus taught them. Jesus invited the Apostles to rest, but he rested not. He recognized his Father's work in the multitudes who followed him, and he taught them and healed their sick.

It is good, even in the midst of apostolic work, to withdraw from the active work, and give some time to recollection.

The perfect life is balanced by active work and quiet recollection. In our days too many persuade themselves that they absolve their consciences by attention to official duties,

and they altogether neglect the development of the interior spiritual life in their souls. The consequence is that they become dry and unspiritual, and hold little communion with their divine Master. In the hearts of such men there reigns a sort of lonely desolation; they give all their time to routine work, and are seldom found alone before the Blessed Sacrament communing with their Master.

The action of Jesus, therefore on this occasion was an example for all of us. But the people, in their zeal to hear Jesus, invade his quiet. As he nears the land, he sees a vast multitude awaiting him; and going forth out of the ship, he ascends with his Apostles a slight elevation of land, and sits down with his twelve. The multitude immediately surround him: "And raising his eyes he saw the great multitude coming to him from all sides."

The time is designated by St. John: "The Passover, the feast of the Jews, was at hand." This designation of time may have been given to explain why so many people were assembled; they may have been assembling to go down to the temple at Jerusalem.

With this pasch the last year of Jesus' life on earth opens; it will close with that great passover, when Jesus will be offered on the cross. The events of this last year occupy more than half of the Gospels. Much of the preceding events had been preparatory; but in this last year Jesus finished his work.

Though the people were importunate and unreasonable in thus intruding at a time when Jesus and his band were seeking a needed rest, yet we see that the Master receives the people with benignity. He teaches them and heals their sick.

There is here also a lesson for the servants of the great Master. Many times the people will invade the priest's quiet, and trouble him with unreasonable and importunate demands. Many times, when the priest is fatigued and hungry, the people will make demands on his time. If the servant wishes to imitate the Master, he must put down his own feelings, stifle the irritability that comes on so readily at such

a time, and he must with benignity and patience counsel the people, instruct them, and aid them in every way in his power.

St. Mark tells us that Jesus taught the people many things; both Matthew and Luke speak of many cures of the sick. While Jesus preaches and heals many, the day passes, and evening is now drawing on, when the Apostles draw near to Jesus, and advise him that the day is declining, and that they are in a desert place, where the multitudes can not procure food. They conjecture that the Master had been so occupied with teaching and healing that he had not adverted to the lateness of the hour and the need of food. They ask therefore that Jesus dismiss the people, that they may go into the nearest villages, and buy food.

It seems quite probable that Philip first came to Jesus, and on the part of the Apostles, made known the condition of things. Jesus makes trial of his faith: "Whence are we to buy bread, that these may eat?"

It is not necessary to tell Christians of our day that Christ "himself knew what he would do." But John wrote in an age when the character of Christ was new to the world; and the Evangelist inserts this line, lest men might think from the question addressed to Philip that Jesus was puzzled by the issue.

It is evident that the Apostles had been discussing the affair of bread for the multitude, and had made estimates on the quantity of bread needed. Philip promptly answers that two hundred pennyworth of bread is not sufficient for the multitudes, that every man might have a little. Had Philip been endowed with the faith that he afterwards had, after the descent of the Holy Ghost, he would have responded: "With thee, O Lord, is all power; thine is the universe and the fullness thereof. Why question we of bread? If it be thy will that these shall eat, speak the word, and they shall be filled."

Philip's interview left the issue undecided, and now the other members of the apostolic body come up, and ask Jesus to dismiss the multitudes. Jesus answers: "The people have no need to go away; give ye them to eat."

Here again he tests their faith. The time came afterwards that every man of that body would have straightway responded: "Lord, if thou willest, we will command the people to sit down, and we will give them food; for thy power can do all things."

We may well note here the difference between the conduct of the Apostles in this event and the Blessed Virgin's conduct on a similar occasion at Cana. She did not raise the question of the difficulty of the thing; but with a calm, sweet trust revealed the need; and then, even when men who know not the hidden ways of faith might think that she was repulsed, she bade all prepare for the miracle. But the Apostles were not equal to Mary in faith and love. After the created humanity of Jesus Christ, Mary his Mother stands alone among angels and men, the most perfect of all God's creatures.

The Apostles make answer to Jesus: "We can not feed these multitudes here, unless we go into the villages and buy two hundred pennyworth of bread." They said this, not in the sense that they proposed a possible way out of the difficulty: they well knew that the specified sum of money was not possessed by them collectively. But their meaning is to represent to the Lord how impossible the thing is. The piece of money here called a penny was a coin in value equivalent to the price of a day's labor; and the Apostles, who had just been commanded to possess no gold or silver or bronze in their wallets could not have been possessed of such a sum.

There is therefore a tinge of irony in the answer of the Apostles. They are surprised that Jesus has asked them to do a naturally impossible thing. No thought seems to have entered their minds to appeal to the power of the Master to supply the need of food.

Jesus asks them: "How many loaves have ye? go and see." It is not reasonable to suppose that the Apostles canvassed the entire multitude, seeking if any had bread. Familiarity with the customs of the East, and a preceding observation had taught them that the people were unprovided with food.

The question of Jesus was not directed to ascertain what provisions the Apostles had in actual possession, but what they were able to procure by ordinary means. Andrew now makes known to Jesus that a lad is present having five barley loaves and two roasted fishes.

Jansenius believes that Andrew there spoke of the food which the Apostles had brought with them; and he believes that the term *παιδάριον* is applied to one of the Apostles.

This seems highly improbable. First, if these loaves and fishes were food which the Apostles had provided for themselves, they would not be spoken of as belonging to a certain one; and secondly, it is incongruous that Andrew should speak of one of his fellow Apostles as a "lad."

Wherefore we believe that Andrew had observed a certain boy carrying these articles, and that he thereby knew that this small portion of food was available.

We can not determine for what definite purpose the boy brought the bread and fishes thither. He may have followed the throngs in the hope of selling them; he may have destined them for his own food.

Jesus speaks of this bread and the fishes as already in the possession of the Apostles; for he knew that their resources were sufficient to procure that quantity of food, or perhaps he knew that the food was freely offered to the Apostles. In fact, it may have been that some one had sent by this boy the offering of this bread and fishes to the Lord and his Apostles. It was not a delicate species of food. The coarse barley loaf was the food of the poor; but Jesus Christ was poor, and led the life of the poor, in the midst of the poor people.

The vast multitude was assembled in a large plain wherein was much grass, affording a pleasant place to sit. Jesus orders his Apostles to make the people sit down on the grass in groups ranging from fifty to one hundred in every group. The people know not the reason for this; but it is the command of Jesus and they obey. Not all of them have divine faith, but they are all filled with awe of Jesus, having seen his wonderful works.

The reason that the people are arranged in groups is that they may be the more easily served with food. It was not a mere mouthful that they were to receive, which they might eat standing, but a full meal.

Mark states that the groups were of hundreds and of fifties respectively; while Luke records that the Lord's commandment had been to arrange the people "in companies, about fifty each." There is no contradiction here. The Lord's words did not impose a command to number heads, and place exactly fifty in each company. The intent of the Lord was to arrange the people in convenient groups, so that the Apostles could readily pass among them distributing the bread and fishes. The Apostles made known to the people the Lord's wishes; and in obeying, they divided up in groups which sometimes numbered a hundred.

The Lord does this to avoid confusion, and also that no man may be passed by without food. The Lord is a great lover of order, and that vast multitude could not, in an orderly manner be fed, without being divided into companies, as Jesus gave commandment to do.

Jesus now orders the bread and the fishes to be brought to him; and lifting up his eyes to Heaven, he blessed them, and broke them, and gave them to his disciples to set before the people. The blessing of the food was an ordinary procedure of our Lord, when about to partake of food. It was an act of thanksgiving to God for the daily bread of the body. But in this particular case, it showed men that the power which wrought the multiplication of that substance was Christ's in virtue of his Divinity by which he was equal to the Father Almighty. The Apostles took up some of the pieces and gave them to the people; they continued to pass around through the companies and serve them with the bread and fish, till every man had eaten, and was filled.

The miracle was wrought in such manner that the miraculous effect became evident to all, while the mode of the act was hidden. The five loaves were broken in pieces, and thus also the two fishes, and the pieces were distributed, and in some way, during the distribution, they were imperceptibly multiplied.

This multiplication of loaves and fishes took place in the same way in which the barrel of meal and the cruse of oil of the widow of Zarephath did not fail until the day that the Lord sent rain upon the earth.—I. [III.] Kings, XVII. 14-16.

Men seek to know how the substance of the bread was increased; whether by creation or conversion of some other created thing. We hold such investigation to be profitless; for we can not know it here. Let men tell how the grass grows; how the food that we eat produces vital energy; how the thinking, reasoning soul gradually exercises its high functions in the child that comes forth from the womb; how the soul can exist separated from the body; how the body, which is constantly changing, and which finally is resolved to dust, and mingled with the common dust of earth, still preserves its identity, and will be again united to the soul,—let men explain these things before they vex their souls with trying to explain the mode of God's operation in extraordinary mysteries.

But there was something in those men that is not in the grave; there is a part of us all that belongs to eternity. And the feeding of the multitude in the desert is but a type of the manner in which Jesus feeds the souls of men. And how little we appreciate this food? How remiss and careless are our efforts to have it? We make great efforts to have the things that serve that little part of us that in a few years will rot in the grave; and we give little or no thought to the things that are necessary to that nobler part of us that shall outlive the great globe itself. Our ambition is directed to promote the pleasure and the glory of a thing which is destined to be the food of worms; and we often forget altogether the interests of that part of us which is destined to live eternal life in the kingdom of God. In this is man's folly, and that folly is well-nigh universal.

If a friend, for whom we had done all things in our power, should continually undervalue, despise, and reject our gifts, we should, after a time, turn from the ungrateful man in disgust. And Christ receives worse ingratitude from many who call themselves his followers. Man should awake to the proper realization that he belongs to eternity; that he is here in a

larval state; and that he has no right to set his heart to have anything permanent here, or rest in anything here; his sole duty here is to fit himself by proper discipline to possess the fullness of life with Christ.

MATT. XIV. 22-36.

MARK VI. 45-56

22. Καὶ εὐθέως ἠνάγκασεν τοὺς μαθητάς αὐτοῦ ἐμβῆναι εἰς πλοῖον, καὶ προάγειν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ πέραν, ἕως οὗ ἀπολύσῃ τοὺς ὄχλους.

23. Καὶ ἀπολύσας τοὺς ὄχλους, ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ ὄρος κατ' ἰδίαν προσεύξασθαι, ὥστιάς δὲ γενομένης, μόνος ἦν ἐκεῖ.

24. Τὸ δὲ πλοῖον ἤδη σταδίου πολλοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἀπείχεν, βασιανίζόμενον ὑπὸ τῶν κυμάτων, ἦν γὰρ ἐναντίος ὁ ἄνεμος.

25. Τετάρτη δὲ ρυλακῇ τῆς νυκτὸς ἦλθεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς περιπατῶν ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν.

26. Οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ ἰδόντες αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης περιπατοῦντα ἐταράχθησαν, λέγοντες: Ὅτι φάντασμα ἐστίν, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ φόβου ἔκραξαν.

27. Εὐθὺς δὲ ἐλάλησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς αὐτοῖς, λέγων: Θαρσεῖτε, ἐγὼ εἰμι, μὴ φοβεῖσθε.

28. Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Πέτρος, εἶπεν αὐτῷ: Κύριε, εἰ σὺ εἶ, κέλευσόν με ἐλθεῖν πρὸς σὲ ἐπὶ τὰ ὕδατα.

29. Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν: Ἐλθέ. Καὶ καταβάς ἀπὸ τοῦ πλοίου Πέτρος, περιεπάτησεν ἐπὶ τὰ ὕδατα, καὶ ἦλθεν πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν.

30. Βλέπων δὲ τὸν ἄνεμον ἰσχυρὸν, ἐφοβήθη, καὶ ἀρξάμενος

45. Καὶ εὐθὺς ἠνάγκασεν τοὺς μαθητάς αὐτοῦ ἐμβῆναι εἰς τὸ πλοῖον, καὶ προάγειν εἰς τὸ πέραν πρὸς Βηθσαϊδάν, ἕως αὐτὸς ἀπολύει τὸν ὄχλον.

46. Καὶ ἀποταξάμενος αὐτοῖς, ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸ ὄρος προσεύξασθαι.

47. Καὶ ὥστιάς γενομένης, ἦν τὸ πλοῖον ἐν μέσῳ τῆς θαλάσσης, καὶ αὐτὸς μόνος ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.

48. Καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτοὺς βασανιζομένους ἐν τῷ ἐλαύνειν, ἦν γὰρ ὁ ἄνεμος ἐναντίος αὐτοῖς, περὶ τετάρτην φυλακὴν τῆς νυκτὸς ἔρχεται πρὸς αὐτοὺς, περιπατῶν ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης, καὶ ἤθελεν παρελθεῖν αὐτούς.

49. Οἱ δὲ ἰδόντες αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης περιπατοῦντα, ἔδοξαν ὅτι φάντασμα ἐστίν, καὶ ἀνέκραξαν.

50. Πάντες γὰρ αὐτὸν εἰδόν, καὶ ἐταράχθησαν. Ὁ δὲ εὐθὺς ἐλάλησεν μετ' αὐτῶν, καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς: Θαρσεῖτε, ἐγὼ εἰμι, μὴ φοβεῖσθε.

καταποντίζεσθαι, ἔκραξεν, λέγων:
Κύριε, σῶσόν με.

31. Εὐθέως δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐκ-
τείνας τὴν χεῖρα, ἐπελάβετο αὐτοῦ,
καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ: Ὁλιγόπιστε, εἰς
τί ἐδίστασας;

32. Καὶ ἀναβάντων αὐτῶν εἰς
τὸ πλοῖον, ἐκόπασεν ὁ ἄνεμος.

33. Οἱ δὲ ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ προσε-
κύνησαν αὐτῷ, λέγοντες: Ἀληθῶς
Θεοῦ Υἱὸς εἶ.

34. Καὶ διαπεράσαντες ἦλθον
ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν εἰς Γεννησαρέτ.

35. Καὶ ἐπιγόντες αὐτὸν οἱ
ἄνδρες τοῦ τόπου ἐκεῖνου, ἀπέστει-
λαν εἰς ὅλην τὴν περίχωρον ἐκείνην,
καὶ προσήνεγκαν αὐτῷ πάντας τοὺς
κακῶς ἔχοντας.

36. Καὶ παρεχάλουν αὐτόν,
ἵνα μόνον ἄψωνται τοῦ κρασπέδου
τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὅσοι ἤψαντο,
διεσώθησαν.

22. And straightway he
constrained the disciples to
enter into the boat, and to go
before him unto the other side,
till he should send the multi-
tudes away.

23. And after he had sent
the multitudes away, he went
up into the mountain apart to
pray: and when even was
come, he was there alone.

51. Καὶ ἀνέβη πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἰς
τὸ πλοῖον, καὶ ἐκόπασεν ὁ ἄνεμος,
καὶ λίαν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἐξίσταντο.

52. Οὐ γὰρ συνῆκαν ἐπὶ τοῖς
ἄρτοις, ἀλλ' ἦν αὐτῶν ἡ καρδιά
πεπωρωμένη.

53. Καὶ διαπεράσαντες ἐπὶ τὴν
γῆν ἦλθον εἰς Γεννησαρέτ, καὶ
προσωρμίσθησαν.

54. Καὶ ἐξελθόντων αὐτῶν ἐκ
τοῦ πλοίου, εὐθὺς ἐπιγόντες αὐτόν,
περιέδραμον ὅλην τὴν χώραν
ἐκείνην,

55. Καὶ ἤρξαντο ἐπὶ τοῖς
κραβάττοις τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας πε-
ριφέρειν, ὅπου ἤκουον ὅτι ἔστιν.

56. Καὶ ὅπου ἂν εἰσεπορεύετο
εἰς κώμας, ἢ εἰς πόλεις, ἢ εἰς ἀγρούς,
ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς ἐτίθεσαν τοὺς ἀσθε-
νοῦντας, καὶ παρεχάλουν αὐτόν,
ἵνα καὶ τοῦ κρασπέδου τοῦ ἱματίου
αὐτοῦ ἄψωνται, καὶ ὅσοι ἂν ἤψαντο
αὐτοῦ, ἐσώζοντο.

45. And straightway he
constrained his disciples to
enter into the boat, and to go
before him unto the other side
to Bethsaida, while he himself
sendeth the multitude away.

46. And after he had taken
leave of them, he departed into
the mountain to pray.

24. But the boat was now in the midst of the sea, distressed by the waves; for the wind was contrary.

25. And in the fourth watch of the night he came unto them, walking upon the sea.

26. And when the disciples saw him walking on the sea, they were troubled, saying: It is an apparition; and they cried out for fear.

27. But straightway Jesus spoke unto them, saying: Be of good cheer; it is I; be not afraid.

28. And Peter answered him and said: Lord, if it be thou, bid me come unto thee upon the waters.

29. And he said: Come. And Peter went down from the boat, and walked upon the waters, and came to Jesus.

30. But when he saw the wind, he was afraid; and beginning to sink, he cried out, saying: Lord, save me.

31. And immediately Jesus stretched forth his hand, and took hold of him, and saith unto him: O thou of little faith, wherefore didst thou doubt?

32. And when they were gone up into the boat, the wind ceased.

47. And when even was come, the boat was in the midst of the sea, and he alone on the land.

48. And seeing them distressed in rowing, for the wind was contrary unto them, about the fourth watch of the night he cometh unto them, walking on the sea; and he would have passed by them:

49. But they, when they saw him walking on the sea, supposed that it was an apparition, and cried out:

50. For they all saw him, and were troubled. But he straightway spoke with them, and saith unto them: Be of good cheer: it is I; be not afraid.

51. And he went up unto them into the boat; and the wind ceased: and they were sore amazed in themselves;

33. And they that were in the boat worshipped him, saying: Of a truth thou art the Son of God.

34. And when they had crossed over, they came to the land, unto Gennesaret.

35. And when the men of that place knew him, they sent into all that region round about, and brought unto him all that were sick;

36. And they besought him that they might only touch the border of his garment: and as many as touched were made whole.

52. For they understood not concerning the loaves, but their heart was hardened.

53. And when they had crossed over, they came to the land unto Gennesaret, and moored to the shore.

54. And when they were come out of the boat, straightway the people knew him.

55. And ran round about that whole region, and began to carry about on their beds those that were sick, where they heard he was.

56. And wheresoever he entered, into villages, or into cities, or into the country, they laid the sick in the market-places, and besought him that they might touch if it were but the border of his garment: and as many as touched him were made whole.

JOHN VI. 14—21.

14. When therefore the people saw the sign which he did, they said: This is of a truth the prophet that cometh into the world.

15. Jesus therefore perceiving that they were about to come and take him by force, to make him king, withdrew again into the mountain himself alone.

16. And when evening came, his disciples went down unto the sea;

14. Οἱ οὖν ἄνθρωποι ἰδόντες ἃ ἐποίησεν σημεῖα, ἔλεγον ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ἀληθῶς ὁ προφήτης ὁ ἐρχόμενος εἰς τὸν κόσμον.

15. Ἰησοῦς οὖν γνοὺς ὅτι μέλλουσιν ἔρχεσθαι, καὶ ἀρπάξειν αὐτόν, ἵνα ποιήσωσιν βασιλέα, ἀνεχώρησεν εἰς τὸ ὄρος αὐτὸς μόνος.

16. Ὡς δὲ ὀψία ἐγένετο κατέβησαν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν.

17. And they entered into a boat, and were going over the sea unto Capharnaum. And it was now dark, and Jesus had not yet come to them.

18. And the sea was rising by reason of a great wind that blew.

19. When therefore they had rowed about five and twenty or thirty furlongs, they behold Jesus walking on the sea, and drawing nigh unto the boat: and they were afraid.

20. But he saith unto them: It is I; be not afraid.

21. They were willing therefore to receive him into the boat: and straightway the boat was at the land whither they were going.

17. Καὶ ἐμβάντες εἰς πλοῖον, ἤρχοντο πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης εἰς Καφαρναούμ, καὶ σκοτία ἤδη ἐγγόνει, καὶ οὐπω πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἐλήλυθει ὁ Ἰησοῦς.

18. Ἡ τε θάλασσα, ἀνέμου μεγάλου πνέοντος, διεγείρετο.

19. Ἐληλακότες οὖν ὡς σταδίους εἰκοσιπέντε ἢ τριάκοντα, θεωροῦσιν τὸν Ἰησοῦν περιπατοῦντα ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης, καὶ ἐγγὺς τοῦ πλοίου γινόμενον, καὶ ἐφοδῆθησαν.

20. Ὁ δὲ λέγει αὐτοῖς: Ἐγώ εἰμι, μὴ φοβείσθε.

21. Ἦθελον οὖν λαβεῖν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ πλοῖον, καὶ εὐθέως ἐγένετο τὸ πλοῖον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς εἰς ἣν ὑπῆγον.

In the twenty-second verse of the text of Matthew, though B omits the article τὸ before πλοῖον, nearly all the other authorities have it. In the twenty-fourth verse the clause, σταδίου πολλούς ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἀπείχεν, is not found in many uncial codices. It is adopted by the Peshitto, Syriac, Cureton's Syriac, the Armenian and Coptic versions. Tischendorf rejects it. In Verse twenty-nine, we accept the reading καὶ ἦλθεν on the authority of B, C*, Cureton's Syriac, the Armenian version, Chrysostom, and Tischendorf. The other authorities have ἐλθεῖν. In Verse thirty ισχυρόν is found after ἀνεμον in B², C, D, et al. It is rejected by Ⲛ, B*, 33, the Coptic version, and by Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort. In Verse thirty-three many codices read ἐλθόντες προσεκύνησαν, which reading is followed by the Vulgate, Syriac and Armenian versions; Ⲛ and B omit the ἐλθόντες, and this is endorsed by the Coptic and Ethiopian versions, and by Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort. In the thirty-fourth verse many codices have εἰς τὴν γῆν Γεννησαρέτ. The reading ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν εἰς Γεννησαρέτ

is found in **Σ**, B, and D, and is approved by Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort.

In the forty-eighth verse of the text of Mark, though the best authorities have *ιδών*, E, F, G, H, U, **Γ**, **Π**², et al., have *εἶδεν*. In Verse forty-nine, the infinitive *εἶναι* is used after *φάντασμα* in A, D, X, **Γ**, **Π**, et al. In Verse fifty-one, the reading *λίαν ἐκ περισσοῦ* has the authority of A, X, **Γ**, **Π**, et al., and of Tischendorf. Most of the codices of the Vulgate follow this reading. In **Σ**, B, L, **Δ**, and 102 *λίαν* stands alone; and this reading is supported by the Peshitto, and Ethiopian versions, and by Westcott and Hort. At the end of Verse fifty-two we find the clause *καὶ ἐθαύμαζον* in A, D, X, **Γ**, **Π**, et al. This is followed by the Armenian and Ethiopian and Syriac versions. In the last member of Verse fifty-two *ἦν γάρ* appears in A, D, M*, X, **Γ**, **Π**, et al. This is followed by the Vulgate, Syriac, Armenian and Ethiopian versions. 'Ἄλλ' *ἦν* is the reading of **Σ**, B, C, **Δ**, 28, 33, and of Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort. In Verse fifty-three *εἰς Γεννησαρέτ* is supported by the authority of **Σ**, B, C, **Δ**, 28, 33, and Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort. A, D, N, X, **Γ**, **Π**, et al., have *ἦλθον ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν Γεννησαρέτ*. This reading is followed by the Vulgate, Syriac, and Ethiopian versions. The Coptic and Armenian versions omit the *τὴν γῆν*. At the end of Verse fifty-four, A, D, and **Δ** add *οἱ ἄνδρες τοῦ τόπου ἐκείνου*. This is followed by the Syriac and Armenian versions.

Night was drawing on when the multitudes had finished eating the loaves and the fishes. The vast multitude knew whence they had been fed, and they acknowledge that the author of the wondrous miracle is the great Prophet for whom Israel had long waited.

But they had heard that the great Prophet should be a king, that he should sit on the throne of David, and that his kingdom should be glorious and without end. They were not spiritual men; the ordinary man of the world is never a spiritual man. It is only by a mighty effort to rise above nature that we climb up to the plane of a spiritual man. The men who make up the rank and file of humanity do not make this effort, and do not live on this plane.

These men therefore began to formulate a design to proclaim Jesus the king of the Jews. Jesus became aware of their intentions; and he therefore immediately constrained his Apostles to re-embark, and to make for the opposite shore. The Apostles obey, and then Jesus dismisses the people, and withdraws into the mountain, where he had at first sat while he taught the multitudes.

The force of the *παλιν*, *again*, used by St. John implies that, during the feeding of the multitude and the re-embarkation of the Apostles, Jesus had come down close to the shore of the lake. When he had dismissed the multitude, he withdrew again up into the mountain alone. Jesus had no difficulty in dismissing the multitude; for there was in him that majesty of presence that when he would be obeyed, an unseen power moved the hearts of men to do his commands.

Jesus went into the seclusion of the mountain to get away from all society of men, that he might commune with Heaven in conditions most favorable to prayer. He needed not this for himself, but he did it for us, to teach us the way of perfection.

We see also in the present event a striking example of the humility of Jesus. He flees from honors and praise with the eagerness with which we run away from humiliations and trials. When they sought him to crucify him, he went to meet them, and offered himself to them; when they seek him to make him king, he flees away into the mountain alone. He was their King, but not in the sense in which they conceived it. He was their King, and he is our King, and the King of the universe, in that higher, better sense that only spiritual men can appreciate. These men sought to make Jesus a King in a worldly sense; let us seek to make him our King in the true sense. Let us make him our King in the sense that St. Bernard in ecstatic love cried out: "I have found the heart of a King, of a Brother, of a loving Friend Jesus." Let us make him our King in the sense that we believe in him with all our soul, and that we love him with all our soul. Let us make him our King in the sense that all we do in thought, word, and deed is for Jesus Christ. Perhaps in the past, pleasure or gain has been our king. Let it be so no longer. Let us not

waste the great possibilities of life on the dross of this world. It is only the love of Jesus Christ and his service which make it great to live.

The Apostles began their voyage across the lake at night-fall. Though there was no storm like to that which they had encountered in going over to the land of the Gerasenes, nevertheless there was a contrary wind, so that the boat was tossed about by the waves, and small headway was made towards the point towards which their course was directed. Such conditions continued until the fourth watch of the night, and at that time they had made only twenty-five or thirty stadia of the voyage. The stadium was originally the distance between the terminal pillars of the stadium at Olympia, which consisted of six hundred feet. It was afterwards adopted by the Romans as a measure of distance.

The fourth watch of the night began at three o'clock after midnight, and lasted until six in the morning; hence we can well imagine the difficulty of the voyage, when the Apostles were only able to row about three miles over the course in that time.

This storm was also a type of harder storms that awaited the Apostles in their apostolic life. The Lord Jesus allows them to be buffeted by the waves during the greater portion of the night, to test their faith, and to show them that though he was not with them in bodily presence, yet his power was with them.

At the fourth watch the Apostles see Jesus coming towards them walking upon the sea. They saw by his course that he would pass by them; they thought it was an apparition, and they cried out in terror. At their cry, Jesus speaks to them words of tenderness and encouragement: "Be ye of good cheer: it is I; be ye not afraid."

By walking upon the waves, Jesus shows himself to be Lord of the elements, the Lord of nature. It must have made a deep impression on the minds of the Apostles to see their Master there in the midst of the storm and the night walking upon the waves.

In showing forth that he would have passed them by, if they had not called to him, the Lord Jesus shows us the neces-

sity of petition in our distresses. He is always within hearing of our cries; but he may pass us by, if our faith move us not to cry to him in our need.

Peter now shows forth that impulsiveness of character and ardor of faith which always distinguished him. The Lord was within sound of a human voice, and Peter cries out: "Lord, if it be thou, bid me come to thee upon the waters." And Jesus answered: "Come." At that one word, Peter descended from the boat, "and walked upon the waters, and came to Jesus."

This event shows the greatness of Peter's faith. In expressing his request in hypothetical form, he does not indicate any doubt. It is simply a form of speech to express a wish to come to Jesus. Not one in the boat doubted that it was Jesus upon the sea, after he had spoken to them. There was that in his words that convinced them that it was he.

But Peter's faith was more than a mere belief in the presence there of Jesus: it was a belief in his character, in his power. At Jesus' sole word Peter committed himself to the mercy of the waves where no human power could save him. It was not a mere experiment, a mere trial; men do not make such experiments at the peril of their lives. It was faith, and this faith was so strong that Peter walked upon the waters, and came close to Jesus.

We have before declared that we approve the reading, "and came to Jesus." It is supported by excellent authority, and is in harmony with the context. We know that, at the time that Peter began to sink, he was so near that Jesus put forth his hand, and sustained him. Now the fact that Peter had gone forth from the boat, and walked to a point so close to Jesus, justifies the expression, "and came to Jesus." We believe that the reading of the other codices arose from the consideration that Peter did not perfectly succeed in what he attempted to do before he began to sink. But the fact that he came so close to Jesus justifies the reading which we defend.

As Peter progressed upon the waters, it is natural to suppose that his faith grew stronger. But now Jesus would perfect his faith still more, and therefore he submits it to a severer test. By the permission of Jesus, the wind now increased in violence, the waves grew more furious, and Peter

feared, and at this juncture the Lord Jesus permitted him to sink; whereupon Peter cried out: "Lord, save me." And Jesus stretched forth his hand, and took hold of him and saith unto him: "O thou of little faith, wherefore didst thou doubt?" And Jesus and Peter went up into the boat, and the wind ceased, "and straightway the boat was at the land whither they were going."

The whole passage concerning Peter's walking upon the waters to come to Jesus is omitted by Mark, and the reason is evident. Though Peter wavered a little in faith at the last moment, nevertheless the whole event was an indication of greater faith than that displayed by the other Apostles. By faith he went forth out of the boat upon stormy waves, wherein no man could live by natural power; by faith he actually walked upon these waves; and his fear, even in the supreme test, moved him to seek rescue from Jesus.

Now Mark derived his data largely from the oral preaching of Peter; and the Apostle in humility omitted this episode.

By allowing Peter partially to sink, the Lord Jesus forcibly teaches Peter on whose power to rely in the storms that should come upon him as the prince of the Apostles. No man can fail who is doing Jesus Christ's work. He may not achieve that at which he aims, but he can not fail by the force of outside causes. If such a one fail, it must be by a defection in himself, by ceasing to do Christ's work; and, of course, for such failures the Master is not responsible.

St. Peter's walking on the waves illustrates our life of faith. When Jesus bade St. Peter come to him upon the waves, St. Peter believed, and the effect of his faith was the fact that he walked upon the waters. Jesus Christ also bids us to come to him over the stormy sea of life. By faith we go forth to come to him, and if we believe as we should believe, and make our lives conform to our faith there is no storm that can submerge us. Christ may allow our faith to be tested; he may allow the waves to rage in wild tumult; he may allow the angry winds to buffet us, and afflict us; but they can not destroy us. When our conscience assures us that we are following the Lord, we may be careless of all things that are against us. But our conscience must be

honest. Some hoodwink their consciences, and persuade themselves that that is right which their misguided wills desire. Selfish interests prevent them from an honest scrutiny of their lives. It becomes second nature in them to scant the rights of justice and right in favor of themselves. They have become so used to their false standards that they, in a measure, adopt them as true; they deceive themselves. They are responsible for the deception, for it is the outcome of falsehood and of the excessive service of this world.

No man has greater motives of happiness even in this world than the true follower of Christ. He may have nothing of this world's goods, but he knows that he has eternal treasures in Heaven. His life may be beset by storms; but he knows that the Master is near, and the Master will not let the storms of life destroy him. That hand that saved St. Peter on Gennesaret's waves is ready to save every one that cries to the Lord for help. The storm may for a time shut out the light of Heaven; it may seem to us, as it seemed to St. Peter, that we are perishing; but if we have faith, we can not perish. God's power is infinite, and God's power is pledged to save every man who trusts in God. Our faith in God and in all God has taught should be absolute, without any reservation; it should be a total giving of ourselves to God, without any questioning of God's ways and judgments. We should be content with the dim seeing that God grants us here, and wait for the day of the full manifestation. That disposition of mind which continually draws back at the mysterious, and falters, and halts, and wonders, and questions, is fatal to faith. The travelers who go to sea in ships lie down to sleep at night in the storm and feel a sense of security because they know that one who knows the sea is on the bridge, and capable men are at all the posts. And yet these men can fail, and often have failed. In following Christ our Captain is omniscient and almighty: The winds, and the sea, and all things obey him. Why therefore do we fear? or why do we complain of our lot in life? Our present life has only one purpose, to prepare us for Heaven, and God alone knows how to dispose our lives for that great end. What matters it therefore whether it be by sunshine or storm, by peace

or by war, by prosperity or by adversity that God makes us fit for our true country which is Heaven? Jesus gently chided St. Peter for his lack of faith. Jesus had told St. Peter to come to him, and by that invitation became pledged to protect him. And so it is with us; no obstacle can prevent us from coming to Jesus, if we faithfully direct our lives to him. To lose hope in the face of any possible danger is an insult to our divine Leader.

St. Mark tells us that on account of the hardness of their hearts, the Apostles had not realized the full significance of the multiplication of the loaves and fishes. They were often slow to believe; and Jesus was often obliged to chide them for weakness in faith. But when Jesus came into the boat that night, they believed in him, and worshipped him, saying: "Of a truth, thou art the Son of God." This was the grand object of all the miracles of Christ, to bring the world to a confession of that truth, on which the Christian religion is founded. All creeds that do not begin with that confession and end with it are spurious.

The place at which they landed is called both by Matthew and by Mark Gennesaret. This name designates that region which slopes down to the Lake of Gennesaret on the west and northwest. It was a beautiful and fertile region, and had within its confines the cities Capharnaum, Corozain, Magdala, Tiberias, and Bethsaida. And when the men of that region heard that Jesus was in their land, they brought to him their sick, wherever he chanced to be. And even those who touched the hem of his garment were healed. They placed the sick in the market places and the streets, and besought Jesus that he might allow the hem of his garment to touch them, and this touch was sufficient, and Jesus healed them all. This touch of the hem of Jesus' garment is to be understood in the same manner as that touch which healed the woman having the issue of blood.—Luke VIII. 44.

With what avidity these people seek the temporal benefit of health from Jesus? It belonged to this present order of things: it was sensible. But that same people turned away from Jesus, when he taught them the truths of his kingdom. It is the everlasting error that ruins the life of

man. There is no error more fatal to man's proper life. Man is ever prone to prize this world, and to neglect eternal life; and he gives his life to a world that can only give him in return a grave in which his body shall rot.

JOHN VI. 22—47.

22. On the morrow the multitude which stood on the other side of the sea saw that there was no other boat there, save one, and that Jesus entered not with his disciples into the boat, but that his disciples went away alone;

23. Howbeit there came boats from Tiberias nigh unto the place where they ate the bread after the Lord had given thanks:

24. When the multitude therefore saw that Jesus was not there, neither his disciples, they themselves got into the boats, and came to Capharnaum, seeking Jesus.

25. And when they found him on the other side of the sea, they said unto him: Rabbi, when camest thou hither?

26. Jesus answered them and said: Verily, verily, I say unto you, Ye seek me, not because ye saw signs, but because ye ate of the loaves, and were filled.

27. Work not for the meat which perisheth, but for the meat which abideth unto eternal life, which the Son of man shall give unto you: for him the Father, even God, hath sealed.

22. Τῇ ἐπαύριον ὁ ὄχλος ὁ ἐστηκώς πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης, εἶδον ὅτι πλοῖάριον ἄλλο οὐκ ἦν ἐκεῖ, εἰ μὴ ἓν, καὶ ὅτι οὐ συνεισῆλθεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, εἰς τὸ πλοῖον, ἀλλὰ μόνοι οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἀπῆλθον,

23. Ἄλλα ἦλθεν πλοῖα ἐκ τῆς Τιβεριάδος ἐγγὺς τοῦ τόπου ὅπου ἔφαγον τὸν ἄρτον, εὐχαριστήσαντος τοῦ Κυρίου:

24. Ὅτε οὖν εἶδεν ὁ ὄχλος ὅτι Ἰησοῦς οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκεῖ, οὐδὲ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, ἀνέβησαν αὐτοὶ εἰς τὰ πλοῖα, καὶ ἦλθον εἰς Καφαρναούμ, ζητοῦντες τὸν Ἰησοῦν.

25. Καὶ εὐρόντες αὐτὸν πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης, εἶπον αὐτῷ: Ραββί, πότε ὧδε γέγονας;

26. Ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν: Ἀμὴν, ἀμὴν λέγων ὑμῖν, ζητεῖτέ με οὐχ ὅτι εἴδετε σημεῖα, ἀλλ' ὅτι ἐφάγετε ἐκ τῶν ἄρτων, καὶ ἐχορτάσθητε.

27. Ἔργάζεσθε μὴ τὴν βρώσιν τὴν ἀπολλυμένην, ἀλλὰ τὴν βρώσιν τὴν μένουσαν εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον, ἣν ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὑμῖν δώσει: τοῦτον γὰρ ὁ Πατὴρ ἐσφράγισεν, ὁ Θεός.

28. They said therefore unto him: What must we do, that we may work the works of God?

29. Jesus answered and said unto them: This is the work of God, that ye believe in him whom he hath sent.

30. They said therefore unto him: What then doest thou for a sign, that we may see, and believe thee? What workest thou?

31. Our fathers ate the manna in the wilderness; as it is written: He gave them bread out of Heaven to eat.

32. Jesus therefore said unto them: Verily, verily, I say unto you: Moses gave you not bread out of Heaven; but my Father giveth you the true bread out of Heaven.

33. For the bread of God is that which cometh down out of Heaven, and giveth life unto the world.

34. They said therefore unto him: Lord, evermore give us this bread.

35. Jesus said unto them: I am the bread of life: he that cometh to me shall not hunger, and he that believeth in me shall never thirst.

36. But I said unto you that ye have seen me, and yet believe not.

37. All that which the Father giveth me shall come unto me; and him that cometh

28. Εἶπον οὖν πρὸς αὐτόν: Τί ποιῶμεν, ἵνα ἐργαζώμεθα τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Θεοῦ.

29. Ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς: Τοῦτό ἐστὶν τὸ ἔργον τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἵνα πιστεύητε εἰς ὃν ἀπέστειλεν ἐκεῖνος.

30. Εἶπον οὖν αὐτῷ: Τί οὖν ποιεῖς σὺ σημεῖον, ἵνα εἴδωμεν καὶ πιστεύσωμέν σοι; τί ἐργάζῃ;

31. Οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν τὸ μάννα ἔφαγον ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, καθὼς ἐστὶν γεγραμμένον: Ἄρτον ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς φαγεῖν.

32. Εἶπεν οὖν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς: Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν: Οὐ Μωϋσῆς ἔδωκεν ὑμῖν τὸν ἄρτον ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ἀλλ' ὁ Πατήρ μου δίδωσιν ὑμῖν τὸν ἄρτον ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τὸν ἀληθινόν.

33. Ὁ γὰρ ἄρτος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστὶν ὁ καταβαίνων ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ ζωὴν διδοὺς τῷ κόσμῳ.

34. Εἶπον οὖν πρὸς αὐτόν: Κύριε, πάντοτε δὸς ἡμῖν τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον.

35. Εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς: Ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος τῆς ζωῆς: ὁ ἐρχόμενος πρὸς ἐμέ, οὐ μὴ πεινάσῃ, καὶ ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ, οὐ μὴ διψήσῃ πώποτε.

36. Ἀλλ' εἶπον ὑμῖν ὅτι καὶ ἑώρακατέ με, καὶ οὐ πιστεύετε.

37. Πᾶν ὃ δίδωσιν μοι ὁ Πατήρ, πρὸς ἐμέ ἤξει, καὶ τὸν ἐρχόμενον πρὸς με, οὐ μὴ ἐκβάλω ἔξω.

to me I will in no wise cast out.

38. For I am come down from Heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me.

39. And this is the will of him that sent me, that of all that which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up at the last day.

40. For this is the will of my Father, that every one that beholdeth the Son, and believeth in him, should have eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day.

41. The Jews therefore murmured concerning him, because he said: I am the bread which came down out of Heaven.

42. And they said: Is not this Jesus, the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know? how doth he now say: I am come down out of Heaven?

43. Jesus answered and said unto them: Murmur not among yourselves.

44. No man can come to me, except the Father who sent me draw him: and I will raise him up in the last day.

45. It is written in the Prophets: And they shall all be taught of God. Every one that hath heard from the Father, and hath learned, cometh unto me.

38. Ὅτι καταβέβηκα ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, οὐχ ἵνα ποιῶ τὸ θέλημα τὸ ἐμόν, ἀλλὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πέμψαντός με.

39. Τοῦτο δέ ἐστιν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πέμψαντός με, ἵνα πᾶν ὃ δέδωκέν μοι, μὴ ἀπολέσω ἐξ αὐτοῦ, ἀλλ' ἀναστήσω αὐτὸ τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ:

40. Τοῦτο γάρ ἐστιν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Πατρὸς μου, ἵνα πᾶς ὁ θεωρῶν τὸν Υἱόν, καὶ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτόν, ἔχῃ ζωὴν αἰώνιον, καὶ ἀναστήσω αὐτόν ἐγὼ τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ.

41. Ἐγόγγυζον οὖν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι περὶ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι εἶπεν: Ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος ὁ καταβάς ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.

42. Καὶ ἔλεγον: Οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς ὁ υἱὸς Ἰωσήφ, οὗ ἡμεῖς οἶδαμεν τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα; πῶς νῦν λέγει, ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβέβηκα;

43. Ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς: Μὴ γογγύζετε μετὰ ἀλλήλων.

44. Οὐδεὶς δύναται ἔλθειν πρὸς ἐμέ, ἐὰν μὴ ὁ Πατὴρ ὁ πέμψας με ἐλκύσῃ αὐτόν, καὶ γὰρ ἀναστήσω αὐτόν ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ.

45. Ἔστιν γεγραμμένον ἐν τοῖς προφήταις: Καὶ ἔσονται πάντες διδασκτοὶ Θεοῦ. Πᾶς ὁ ἀκούσας παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ μαθὼν, ἔρχεται πρὸς ἐμέ.

46. Not that any man hath seen the Father, save he who is from God, he hath seen the Father.

46. Οὐχ ὅτι τὸν Πατέρα ἑώραχέν τις, εἰ μὴ ὁ ὢν παρὰ Θεοῦ, αὗτος ἑώρακεν τὸν Πατέρα.

47. Verily, verily, I say unto you: He that believeth hath eternal life.

47. Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν: Ὁ πιστεύων ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

In Verse twenty-six of the text of John μέ is omitted by **ℵ**, A, by the Sinaitic Syriac, and by Tischendorf. In Verse thirty-nine Πατρός is added by Γ, Δ, Λ, Π et al. This reading is followed by the Vulgate, Armenian and Ethiopian versions, and by Cyril and Augustine. In the last clause of Verse thirty-nine αὐτόν is found in E, G, H, S, V, Γ, Δ, Λ, et al. In the fortieth Verse τοῦ πέμψαντός με is omitted after τοῦ Πατρός μου in **ℵ**, B, C, D, L, T and U: it is rejected by the Sahidic, Coptic, Syriac, Armenian and Ethiopian versions, and by many of the Fathers. In Verse forty-seven εἰς ἐμέ is omitted by **ℵ**, B, C and T.

The multitude that had been fed with the five loaves and two fishes passed the night in the region round about where the miracle had been performed. They saw that there was only one boat there on that evening, and that the disciples entered into that boat, and put out for the other side, leaving Jesus on the site of the miracle. The people therefore believed that Jesus was still in the region where they had eaten the bread; and when morning dawned, they sought him. In the meantime, ships come over from Capharnaum, and as they knew that Jesus dwelt much at Capharnaum, they take passage in these ships, and go over to Capharnaum, and there they find him; and they, in the native simplicity of Syrians, ask him how he was come thither.

Their surprise was well founded; for a miracle of which they knew nothing had been wrought. The wonderment of the people impressed the Apostles; for their minds were filled with the marvelous events, of the preceding night, and this astonishment of the people was in itself a corroboration of the veracity of the miracle, and it is recorded for that purpose by St. John.

To understand the simple question addressed to Jesus by the multitude, one must have travelled in Syria, and must have observed the simple, childish ways of the people.

Jesus answers not the question; for its answer would involve the explanation of an event that he did not wish to be made public at that time. But he takes occasion of their seeking him to address to them a call to the supernatural order.

There is a slight difficulty in the twenty-sixth verse, wherein Jesus declares that the multitude follow him not on account of his miracles, but because they ate of the loaves, and were filled. Now in the second verse of the same chapter, the Evangelist explicitly affirms that this same great multitude followed Jesus, because they saw the signs which he did. There is no contradiction here, if we look into the deeper signification of Jesus' words. The people were always willing to follow Jesus while he healed their sick, and wrought other miracles. Had he done naught but this, he would never have encountered the opposition of the Jews. But the people failed to see in these miracles the real object for which they were performed. Miracles in the life of Jesus were only a means to an end, a means to prove his divine character, and his mission, and to draw men to have faith in him. The immediate physical effect of the miracles only affected a limited number of beings, but the faith in Jesus was to be the life of the world. Now Jesus says in effect that it was not the signs, considered as proofs of his Divinity, that drew the people, but only the signs in the beneficent effect that they had on man's present life. They would eat the bread in the desert, and bring their sick to be healed; but they turned away from the bread of life, and rejected the cure of their souls. As Cardinal Wiseman remarks: "This discourse opened amidst the wonder, the admiration, the reverence of the multitudes: it closed with the scoffs and persecution of the Jews, the desertion of the disciples, and the vacillating perplexity of his chosen twelve." And this effect followed, because the people did not grasp the proper aim and significance of the miracles.

It was a method of teaching employed by our Saviour to take occasion from some work in the natural order to illustrate some truth in the supernatural order which bore to the natural

entity some metaphorical resemblance. Thus conversing with the Samaritan woman at the well, he takes occasion to discourse of the eternal fount of divine grace. So in the present case, from the feeding of the multitudes Jesus proceeds to the higher order of being, to the world of the soul, and speaks of the food by which the soul lives. The bread which the multitude ate in the desert on the eastern shore of Lake Gennesaret was the food that perisheth. The multitudes readily accepted this from Jesus. In every age of the world man is ready to give his thought and his labor for that bread. Now Jesus tells man in the twenty-seventh verse that there is something better and more lasting that should be the object of man's aspirations and his toil. There is something eternal, adapted to the high nature of man's soul, and to the acquisition of this, Jesus exhorts his hearers.

Expositors differ widely in determining the exact entity meant by the "meat which abideth unto eternal life." Wiseman believes that there is thereby signified the doctrines of Jesus; Patrizi believes that it is faith in Jesus Christ; Corluy sees therein the Holy Eucharist; Augustine asserted that it signified Christ; Maldonatus enlarges the concept, and includes therein all things that pertain to eternal life. The true sense seems to be that "the meat that abideth unto eternal life" is the new creation of supernatural life in man. This will include Christ intellectually apprehended by faith; it will include divine grace, as the necessary force by which that life is maintained; it will include faith in all the truths of the Christian religion, as the bond binding man to the source of supernatural life; and it will include love and hope, which are infused into the soul as necessary factors to maintain its life.

Jesus the Incarnate Word, and hence truly the Son of Man, gives these entities, and none but he can give them.

But all these entities are in a certain sense identified with Christ. To hold to Christ and to all that Christ stands for, is to have them all in one's heart. Hence we believe that there is no difference between the "meat which abideth unto eternal life" of the twenty-seventh verse and the "bread of life" of the thirty-fifth verse. Wherefore Jesus Christ, the Redeemer, the Author of grace, the Head of the Church, the Teacher of

man is "the meat which abideth unto eternal life" and the "bread of life." He is the truth, the way, and the life. We receive from him the truth which guides us in the spiritual life. If every other word that was ever spoken or written were blotted out of the memory of man, the words of Jesus and his divine power through the Church would be sufficient. He is the way; because not only has he told us what to do, but he has lived his teaching in the sight of men, and has left us an example how we should live. He is the life; for from him we receive the life of our souls, and the graces by which that life is supported.

Our bodies are nourished by bread, by eating it; our souls are nourished by Jesus Christ, by believing in him, loving him, and keeping his commandments. The Father will not save us independently of the Son, for the Father has appointed the Son the sole Mediator between God and man. The universe belongs to Christ; and there is no other name under Heaven given among men, wherein we must be saved. Now therefore Jesus, who is the sole Source and Author of the spiritual life, can justly call himself the "meat which abideth unto eternal life" and the "bread of life."

Some difficulty is encountered in explaining the peculiar force of the expression, "for him the Father God has sealed." Dispensing with the review of the various opinions which have been pronounced on this question, we believe that Jesus wishes thereby to declare the authenticity of his mission, and the warrant by which he offered himself to the world as "the food that abideth unto eternal life." The people saw before them a being in outward form and fashion a man; and this man laid claim to be the source, not only of life, but of eternal life. Naturally the thought would arise in human minds: Whence hath this man the power to do this? Wherefore Jesus produces his proof. The sealing of the document gives it its authenticity. And God the Father sealed the Son as man; because he commissioned him to be the Saviour of men, and King of the universe. The basis of this authentic mission is the co-equal sonship of Jesus Christ. The man who proclaimed himself the bread of life in that assembly at Capharnaum, did so because he was at the same time the Son of God, "in whom

dwellleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily, and in whom we are made full, who is the head of all principality and power." —Coloss. II. 7-10. More than food to the body, more than the light and heat of the sun to life in nature is Jesus Christ to the soul of man. Up to the fiftieth verse of the present chapter, Jesus propounds the broad necessary truth of his relation to the spiritual life of man; in the following verses he defines one great way to receive that life which must come from him.

Christ speaks of this giving as a future thing, because the Church through which the life should be communicated to the believers was not yet fully organized; and secondly, because the spiritual life which comes from Christ is always a future effect, considered in its relation to the man who is actually in the state of mortal sin.

The effect of the natural food of the body is transient; it nourishes for a time, and then its efficacy is gone, and the body needs more food. But the spiritual food which comes from Christ is of its own nature eternal. True it is that its possession does not confirm to man the possession of eternal life in Heaven; but this is not owing to its own intrinsic insufficiency. Of itself it is incorruptible, and its effect is eternal; and it is only because man renders himself incapable of receiving its effect, that man dies a spiritual death.

Jesus had spoken of working for this wonderful meat; they therefore rightly conceive that there is question of some *work* for them to do. They therefore ask what they shall do, that they may accomplish that work. They call the achievement the works of God, meaning thereby works which shall obtain from God the grand effect spoken of by Jesus. And Jesus answers them that the work of which he spoke, the work which obtains the "meat which abideth unto eternal life," is to believe in him whom God had sent. It is a more elegant and more forcible expression than though Jesus had said, "to believe in me." It directs the faith of mankind to Jesus, and at the same time, assigns the reason of that faith to be his authentic mission from the Father. This present verse is in perfect accord with the twenty-seventh verse; for faith in

Jesus Christ is the actual employment and use of the bread of life which is Christ.

Christ speaks of the obtaining of spiritual life as a work; not in the sense that it is an achievement of man's own powers; but because God demands in the act man's co-operation. God does not consider men as passive buckets into which to pump salvation. Man can not believe, or hope, or love as it behooveth, without the antecedent grace and the help of the Spirit of God; but in the working of this effect, God demands, as a necessary part of the work, that man shall co-operate.

The Jews now ask for a miracle to attest the veracity of Christ's teachings. It is quite probable that these who ask this question were not of the simple people, but of the scribes and Pharisees. They adduce the fact of the manna in the wilderness, corroborating the historical account of Exodus by the words of the Psalm: "And he rained down manna upon them to eat, and gave them bread from heaven."—Ps. LXXVIII. 24 [Vulg. LXXVII.].

The allusion to the manna arises naturally out of the discourse of Jesus. He had spoken of a food that was unlike all other foods, a food that gave to man eternal life; and he had told them that the means of having this food was to believe in him. Now the Jews did not yet understand the nature of that wondrous food. Their thoughts go back to the manna that was rained down from heaven, and they mention it, thinking that perhaps the food of which Jesus speaks is in some way like to this. They are also eager that Jesus should work a miracle. They were far removed from the dispositions which are necessary for faith. Jesus had already wrought many miracles: he had raised the dead in the very city in which they were assembled. Many of those present in this event had come over the lake after eating the loaves and the fishes, and still they ask for more miracles. Jesus ignores their demand, but taking occasion of their mention of the manna, he continues to illustrate the high theme of faith in himself, and he continues to lead the discourse up to that point where he will promulgate the grand doctrine of the Eucharist.

Jesus therefore says to them: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Moses gave you not bread from Heaven; but my Father giveth you the true bread from Heaven."

Jesus does not contradict the statement of the Psalm, but he uses the term Heaven in another sense. The manna was a mere material food which dropped down from out of the air. The heaven from which it came was the visible heaven. But the bread of which Jesus spoke, the bread which he himself was, came down from the Empyrean, from the Heaven of the throne of God; and this bread was like to the nature of the Heaven whence it came.

The mention of Moses in this place is of deep significance. Moses was the founder of the first alliance; Jesus is the founder of the New Testament. The food which supported the people who marched with Moses was sent by God from the visible heaven; the food that sustains the followers of Jesus is sent by God from the throne of God himself. Though the explicit doctrine of the Eucharist is not promulgated until the fifty-first verse, nevertheless the conception of the Eucharist existing in Christ's mind impresses a certain character on the whole passage. For the Eucharist is naught else than Christ himself existing in a sacramental mode of being. Now Moses was a type of Christ; and the manna was a type of the Eucharist; and as the Eucharist is not common bread, but Jesus Christ whole and entire, the manna was a type of Jesus himself. Jesus therefore implies that a higher order of things than the Mosaic covenant was now instituted in which types give place to their respective realities. The manna in the desert satisfied the hunger of the wanderers of the Exodus for a few hours; but the bread of the New Testament giveth life unto the world. It is evident that Jesus here speaks of himself as the bread, and of the spiritual life as the life which he will give to the world.

When Jesus declared to the Samaritan woman that he would give a water of which those who drank should never thirst again, and that the water should be a source of eternal life, the woman answered: "Sir, give me this water, that I thirst not, neither come all the way hither to draw." In like manner in the present case, the Jews interpreting Christ's words in a material sense, ask that Jesus give them this bread. They still think that it is some wondrous bread that Jesus will give, something like the manna, but more excellent.

Hitherto Jesus had not declared what the bread was. He had declared its high nature and effects; he had declared that the means of having this bread was to believe in himself. But now he clearly enunciates that he is the bread of life.

What is there in the recorded expressions of human thought like to that sentence? Jesus is the bread of life, the bread that gives and supports eternal life; but this is not all: that bread is freely offered to men; and he who cometh to Jesus, and believeth in him shall nevermore hunger and thirst.

O, if there is one sin that especially grieves the loving heart of Jesus Christ, it must be the coldness with which men respond to this call!

It is evident that Jesus means by this hunger and thirst the spiritual needs of the soul in order that man may live the life of grace on earth and the life of Beatific Vision in Heaven. Ponce de Leon voyaged many miles over an unknown sea in search of a fountain of perpetual youth. If he had found such a fountain in any part of the world, would not all men have flocked thither? Would any perils or hardships deter men from seeking that fountain? And Jesus Christ offers himself to men as a source of eternal life, of eternal youth, of absolute and eternal happiness; and men turn away from him, and choose death instead of life.

The world is full of sorrow. From all quarters where the sons of men inhabit we hear cries of distress, disappointment, and despair. Men are wildly and fiercely contending for the prizes of this world. Most men think and act as though the world were not redeemed, and as though man were placed here for one thing only, to make the most of this present troubled existence. If this world goes with them, they become proud, haughty and self-centered; if it goes against them, they become sad, despondent, and bitter. They look upon the end of life not as the transition from exile and trial to the possession of our true country, but rather as the sad parting from all that the heart has ever loved and lived for. And however much of this world man may acquire, it brings no peace. It leaves an everlasting hungering, and thirsting, and stretching out after something that wealth can not give. And behold, Jesus, the source of every true good, is in the world calling men to come

to him, to receive eternal life; and they hearken not nor come. How sad and fatal is the blindness of the world!

The Jews at Capharnaum saw Jesus, they saw his works, they heard his discourse. And they believed not. Great was their sin of unbelief, but is not that the sin of the great world to-day? What profits it to call nations Christian, when the inhabitants thereof think of nothing but wealth, and commerce, and machinery, and pleasure? The doctrines of Jesus are spoken of commonly in human life as something impossible to realize; something that provoke a grim smile by their contrast with the ways of men. Intense is the hunger of man for the bread of this world, which he eats in common with the ox and the horse; but for the bread of God, the bread which giveth eternal life, man careth not, nor laboreth.

The words of Jesus in the thirty-sixth verse seem to refer to some preceding statement of Jesus. Now as an exact expression of that tenor is not recorded in the preceding discourses of Jesus, Toleti and Cornelius à Lapede believe that the Lord there refers to some preceding sentence that is not written. Others hold that the rebuke given in the twenty-sixth verse concerning the false motive through which the Jews followed Jesus would sufficiently justify the expression: "I said," etc.

It seems probable that Jesus there refers to that discourse which is recorded in the fifth chapter of John, wherein Jesus explicitly arraigns the Jews for not believing in him in the face of the greatest evidence. They had the testimony of John the Baptist, they had the testimony of God the Father speaking from Heaven at the baptism of Jesus; they had the testimony of the Holy Ghost coming down upon Jesus in the form of a dove; they had the testimony of the works of Jesus. Certainly this was to *see* him, and yet they believed not.

At all events, Jesus thereby declares that the Jews had had sufficient proofs of the authenticity of his mission in the miracles which he had wrought. He had fulfilled all the works which the prophets foretold that the Messiah should do. That the Jews still refused to believe, was due not to any lack of evidence, but to a criminal incredulity.

In the following verses Jesus assigns the causes of the unbelief of the Jews. The great truth that is central in these

subsequent verses is that faith by which men come to Jesus Christ is a gift of God, and that the Jews believed not in Jesus Christ, because they had not this gift. This reasoning could be reduced to the following syllogisms formed out of Christ's discourse. Christ came down from Heaven not to do his own will, but the will of the Father who sent him. That is to say, the human will of Christ was always in absolute conformity with the will of the Godhead. Christ had two wills. One will was his in virtue of his Divinity, and this was identical with the will of the Father and of the Holy Ghost; for it was the will of the one, indivisible, eternal nature of God. The other will was Christ's in virtue of his humanity. This will was by Christ's own act always conformed to the divine will, even when the natural promptings of human nature would impel in a contrary direction. Now the will of God was that Christ should save those whom God in his foreknowledge had decreed to save; and that he should raise them from the dead at the last day, and present them to the Father. Christ came down from Heaven to do this, and he will do it. He will not lose one of these, he knows them all, and he will raise them up at the last day, and place them in the eternal kingdom of Heaven. These are the ones whom the Father gave to Christ; and they shall come to him; that is to say, they shall believe in him. For the absolute will of the Father is that the elect shall be saved through no other means, save through Christ.

When in the fortieth verse Jesus makes it a condition of salvation that a man shall *behold* him, he means that a man shall come at a knowledge of his real character. Jesus Christ in the flesh was visible to only a small portion of mankind for a few years; but Jesus Christ in his larger rôle, as identified with his Church, as identified with his saving doctrine, as presented to the world by authorized teachers, is visible to all men, as it is written: "All flesh shall see the salvation of God." Now Jesus accepts the responsibility of saving every soul that the Father gives to him. Any man that comes to Christ will not be rejected by him.

Thus we see that to cleave to Christ is not an uncertain means of salvation, but an absolutely certain means. If a man holds to Christ in all that this adhesion means, he is as sure

of eternal life as that God exists. He thereby enters into that number that the Son of God is pledged to his Father to save, and that pledge is guaranteed by the power through which the universe was made. To be in that number is success in life; and to be not in it, is failure, even though we gain the whole world.

And the cause which places a man in that number, or excludes him from it, lies in man's own free will. Man can choose life or death; and what he chooses shall be given unto him. If the dispositions of a man's heart are evil, he can not believe in Christ and be saved; for faith, the gift of God, will not be given to a soul which voluntarily sells itself unto the doing of evil. This was the secret cause that prevented the Jews from believing in Jesus; this was the cause that excluded them from the number of those whom the Father had given unto him.

We need not here try to solve the awful mystery of how God's foreknowledge of that number is compatible with human liberty. We know that God knows all things, and that consequently the elect are predestined from all eternity; we know that man is free, and that God's grace is offered to all men sufficient to save them; we know that to co-operate with that grace unto the achieving of salvation is possible to every man, and that God wishes all men to be saved; but the middle term by which these things are reconciled is hidden from us, and will be forever hidden. We should not wonder that in God's highest counsels there should be found something that our poor minds in our present state can not comprehend.

A murmur now arose from the scribes and Pharisees of the assemblage. How can this man call himself the bread of life? Is not this Jesus, the son of Joseph the poor artisan of Nazareth? Do we not know his father and his mother? How can he declare that he has come down from Heaven? How impossible it is to understand the things of God with that lower intelligence that depends on the corporal senses? It was impossible for the Jews to understand how Jesus of Nazareth could be the Son of God, who had come down from Heaven; for they were not enlightened by the light that enlighteneth every man that cometh into this world. And they had not

this light; because they hardened their hearts and repelled the gift of God.

Jesus straightway declares to them that their murmurs are unjust, and that the cause of their blindness is the fact that the Father has not given them the gift of faith.

Man could enter into the First Alliance with much less faith than that which is required for entrance into the New. That first organization was not a spiritual creation. It was really a very weak and carnal method of worship, with a complex ritual, and offering rewards in this life. But the New Testament is totally spiritual, and can not be apprehended except by pure spiritual faith. Now the Prophet Isaiah looking forward to the character of Christ's kingdom, proclaims that its members shall be those to whom God gives the gift of divine faith. That is to say, membership in the New Covenant necessitates a real interior operation of God in the soul of the believer, by which the man is enabled to believe as it behooveth. The words of the Prophet Isaiah are: "And all thy children shall be taught of the Lord."—Is. LIV. 13.

Jesus declares that any man in whom God works not the interior effect of faith comes not to him, and the Jews were of this latter class. Divine faith is not a thing that is naturally possible: "If any man shall say that, without the Holy Spirit's antecedent inspiration and help, a man can *believe*, hope, love, or repent, as it behooveth, that the grace of justification may be given him, let him be anathema."—Conc. Trid. Sess. VI. Can. III. Faith is a thing supernaturally possible by the grace of God and by the proper dispositions of soul.

In the twenty-fifth verse Jesus declares that: "Every one that has heard from the Father, and *hath learned* cometh unto me." There are two requisites contained in this proposition. The hearing from God is that part that God works in man's justification; the *learning* is the part that man must work. These two causes must co-operate in the salvation of every man that is saved. God always does his part; but man often fails in his co-operation, and to this failure are due all the wrecks that happen among the souls of men.

Lest the gross minds of the Jews, hearing that a man must hear from the Father in order to come to Jesus, might imagine

that the Father would appear visibly to work this effect, the Lord finds it necessary to inform them that they are not to conceive the Father as visibly appearing. Jesus is the only man who has seen the Father; he is the only means of union between the invisible God and man.

The Lord Jesus makes belief in himself the sole absolute cause of eternal life. The Father draws men to this faith, and this faith saves them. To prove the sufficiency of this faith Jesus declares that it operates the grand final effect of all man's hope, the resurrection into eternal life. There is nothing beyond this; it is the consummation of all man's hopes, and he who, drawn by the Father, believes in Jesus Christ, accomplishes this grand and final effect.

Faith in Jesus Christ, as here spoken of, is equivalent to a following of Christ. Christ represents in himself a complete law of belief and conduct; and any one who really believes in Christ, believes in all the doctrines of the Christian religion, as infallibly promulgated and explained by the living organization which Christ founded to teach and save men even to the end of time. This is clear from Christ's own explicit declaration; for his final commission to the Apostles was to teach men all things whatsoever he commanded them. Christ sent the Holy Ghost to teach the Church all things, and to bring to the remembrance of the teachers in the Church all that Jesus had said. Evidently therefore, when Jesus says: "He that believeth in me hath eternal life," he does not speak of a mere cold apprehension of himself as a person who has figured in the history of the world. He speaks of that intellectual act that is the efficient cause of love; of that assent of the mind to the system of truths which crystallize about Christ as a center. Christ is not a dead reality, a memory of one that is gone; he is the living soul of the Church; and if we bind up our souls with him, we shall also live with him for ever.

JOHN VI. 48-59

- | | |
|---|---|
| 48. I am the bread of life. | 48. Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος τῆς ζωῆς. |
| 49. Your fathers did eat
the manna in the wilderness
and they died. | 49. Οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν ἔφαγον
ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τὸ μάννα, καὶ ἀπέθανον. |

50. This is the bread which cometh down out of Heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and not die.

51. I am the living bread which came down out of Heaven: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever: yea and the bread which I will give is my flesh, for the life of the world.

52. The Jews therefore strove one with another, saying: How can this man give us his flesh to eat?

53. Jesus therefore said unto them: Verily, verily, I say unto you: Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye have not life in yourselves.

54. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day.

55. For my flesh is true meat and my blood is true drink.

56. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood abideth in me, and I in him.

57. As the living Father sent me, and I live because of the Father; so he that eateth me, he also shall live because of me.

58. This is the bread which came down out of Heaven: not as the fathers did eat, and died; he that eateth this bread shall live for ever.

50. Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβαίνων, ἵνα τις ἐξ αὐτοῦ φάγῃ καὶ μὴ ἀποθνήσκῃ.

51. Ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ζῶν, ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβάς, ἐάν τις φάγῃ ἐκ τούτου τοῦ ἄρτου, ζήσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, καὶ ὁ ἄρτος δὲ ὃν ἐγὼ δώσω, ἡ σὰρξ μου ἐστίν, ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς.

52. Ἐμάχοντο οὖν πρὸς ἀλλήλους οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι λέγοντες: Πῶς δύναται οὗτος ἡμῖν δοῦναι τὴν σάρκα αὐτοῦ φαγεῖν;

53. Εἶπεν οὖν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς: Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν: Ἐὰν μὴ φάγητε τὴν σάρκα τοῦ Υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, καὶ πίνετε αὐτοῦ τὸ αἷμα, οὐκ ἔχετε ζωὴν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς.

54. Ὁ τρώγων μου τὴν σάρκα, καὶ πίνων μου τὸ αἷμα, ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον, καὶ ἐγὼ ἀναστήσω αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ.

55. Ἡ γὰρ σὰρξ μου ἀληθὴς ἐστίν, βρώσις, καὶ τὸ αἷμά μου ἀληθὴς ἐστίν πόσις.

56. Ὁ τρώγων μου τὴν σάρκα, καὶ πίνων μου τὸ αἷμα, ἐν ἐμοὶ μένει, καὶ ἐγὼ ἐν αὐτῷ.

57. Καθὼς ἀπέστειλén με ὁ ζῶν Πατήρ, καὶ ἐγὼ ζῶ διὰ τὸν Πατέρα, καὶ ὁ τρώγων με, καὶ ἀρκέουσιν ζήσῃ δι' ἐμέ.

58. Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ καταβάς, οὐ καθὼς ἔφαγον οἱ πατέρες, καὶ ἀπθέθανον, ὁ τρώγων τοῦτον τὸν ἄρτον, ζήσῃ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

59. These things said he in the synagogue as he taught in Capharnaum. 59. Ταῦτα εἶπεν ἐν συναγωγῇ διδάσκων ἐν Καφαρναούμ.

In Verse fifty-one we find the reading ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ ἄρτου in **ℵ**, and it is endorsed by Eusebius, Cyprian, and Hilary. In the same verse the phrase ἡ σάρξ μου ἐστίν is at the end of the verse. This arrangement is approved by Tertullian and by Tischendorf. In Verse fifty-two, αὐτοῦ is omitted after τὴν σάρκα in **ℵ**, C, D, L, Γ, Δ, Λ, Π, et al. This reading is approved by Origen, Cyprian, and the Gothic version. B and T insert αὐτοῦ, and this reading is followed by Chrysostom and by all the great versions except the Gothic. In Verse fifty-five the reading ἀληθής—ἀληθής is supported by the excellent authority of **ℵ**^c, B, C, K, L, T, Π, et al., and by Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Eusebius, Basil, Chrysostom, Cyprian, Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort.

This present text is one of the most difficult passages of Holy Scripture. When Raphael wished to paint a symbolic representation of faith, he painted an angel holding in her hand the Chalice and the Host. It is a deep mystery, perhaps the first mystery at which a decadent faith staggers. The great point to determine here is whether or not this text contains a promise of the Eucharist. In that great breaking away from the supernatural, which occurred in the rise of protestantism the doctrine of the Real Presence in the Eucharist was made the object of the fiercest attack. The career of protestantism has been like to the voyage of a ship without a compass, holding no definite course. Luther at first retained the doctrine of Transubstantiation. The Augsburg Confession presented to Charles V., in 1530, contains this statement: "Concerning the Lord's Supper they teach, that the Body and the Blood of Christ are really present under the appearance of bread and wine, and are distributed to the faithful in the Lord's Supper, and they condemn those who teach otherwise." One year later Melancthon struck out the phrase, "under the appearance of bread and wine," and by this modification he evidently aimed to eliminate the doctrine of the total change of the substance of the bread and wine. In 1540 the Augsburg Confession was changed to the following: "Concerning the Lord's

Supper they teach that with the bread and wine there is truly given the body and blood of Christ to those who partake of the Lord's Supper."

This proposition explicitly concedes that the substance of the bread and wine remain in the Eucharist, and hence such theory was termed *consubstantiation* or *companionation*. The next modification was conceived by Carlstadt. Zwingli and Œcolampadius were the first to propose the theory as a definite thesis supported by arguments. This opinion contemplates a purely spiritual presence of Christ in the Eucharist. Zwingli illustrates his system thus: "When the father of a family travels abroad, he presents his wife with his best ring, whereon his image is engraved, saying: 'Behold me your husband, whom you must hold and cherish.' Now that father of the family is the type of Christ. For, departing, he gave to his spouse the Church his image, in the Sacrament of the Supper." To make the words of the institution of the Holy Eucharist agree with this theory Zwingli asserted that in them *ἔστι* signified "represents;" but Œcolampadius placed the metaphor in *σῶμα*, which, according to his interpretation, means "the figure of the body." It is evident that in the theory of Zwingli the words of Christ lose their literal sense. Calvin is also the author of a theory. He asserted that the glorified body of Christ, which exists in Heaven, communicated such virtue to the bread and the wine that he who partook of them in faith might be said to partake of the very body of Christ.

There are strange contradictions concerning the Eucharist in the Anglican formulary of belief. The twenty-eighth article of the Anglican church teaches that "Transubstantiation can not be proved by Holy Writ, but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, and overthroweth the nature of a sacrament." But still it is there stated that "to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith receive the same, the bread which we break is a partaking of the body of Christ, and likewise the cup of blessing is a partaking of the blood of Christ." But this is again contradicted by a subsequent statement, "that the body of Christ is given, taken and eaten only after a heavenly and spiritual manner." At the end of the Communion Service,

as it now stands, there is a declaration that no act of adoration is intended by the act of kneeling to receive the Lord's Supper.

We introduce these statements here to make clear the great difference between protestants and Catholics in their treatment of all texts of the Scripture which relate to the Eucharist. We do not intend to seek in the present text of St. John a promulgation of the doctrine of the Eucharist. Indeed the doctrine of the Eucharist would have a sufficient Scriptural basis if the present text of John had never been written. Cajetan and Jansenius of Ghent deny that the sixth chapter of John relates to the Eucharist. It is not *de fide* that the words of Christ in the present chapter refer to the Eucharist. The present discourse of Jesus *primarily* relates to faith in Christ. But inasmuch as the eating of the real body and the drinking of the real blood of Christ is one great mode of exercising this act of faith in Christ, therefore the idea of the Eucharist pervades the whole discourse. Of course, the doctrine of faith in Jesus Christ is broader than the doctrine of the Eucharist. A man can be saved without the Eucharist, but no man can be saved without Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ could have dispensed with the Eucharist, and could have instituted other means through which salvation might come through him to us. Now we believe that his discourse in St. John is fashioned in accordance with this great truth. It teaches primarily the absolute necessity and all-sufficiency of Jesus Christ, and at the same time, it is pervaded by the idea of that wondrous mode of existence that the same Jesus Christ assumes in the Sacrament of the Eucharist. The Eucharist is included in the more comprehensive truth that Jesus Christ is the source of all spiritual life.

Wiseman and other theologians believe that there is a change of subject at the forty-eighth verse; that here a perfect transition is made from a believing in Christ to a real eating of his body and drinking of his blood. The greater number of Catholic interpreters place the transition in the fifty-first verse. Corluy on the other hand denies that there is any such change of subject in the discourse, and he believes that the Eucharist is the theme of the whole discourse.

We shall follow a middle course between these two extremes. We believe that the great comprehensive theme of the whole discourse is faith in Christ; and that, inasmuch as faith in Christ includes faith in the Eucharist, which is nothing else but Christ himself existing in a sacramental mode of being, therefore Christ, the bread of life, as united to the soul by faith, and Christ in the Eucharist under the form of bread and wine are not two disparate themes, but one identical entity in two modes of being. Wherefore the two concepts blend together, and one cannot be treated independently of the other. The idea of the Eucharist runs through the whole discourse, but the other idea of Christ as united to the soul by faith is the stronger idea up to the second member of the fifty-first verse. From that point in the discourse up to the fifty-eighth inclusively, the leading thought is the sacramental mode of being in which Jesus Christ was to give himself to man.

The Eucharist presupposes faith in Jesus Christ as the bread of life. The Eucharist is not an eternal mode of Jesus' being. After the consummation of the present order of things Jesus will no longer assume this sacramental mode of being. Hence Jesus first draws men to him as the eternal source of all life, and then he unites with himself as the object of faith that great sacrament by which men will be brought into an ineffably close union with him. In this discourse the mind must first apprehend Jesus as the center and source of all life, and then follow him as he develops that same theme to include that inscrutable mode of being in which Jesus gives himself to men. This discourse contained a promise of what Jesus was to do. The declaration had a certain obscurity as found in prophecy. The clearer message was that Jesus was the efficient cause of man's life. Men were not ready yet for the doctrine of the Eucharist in all its fullness. A mysterious promise was given; and when it was fulfilled at the Last Supper then the Lord spoke clearer, and his apostles understood the message, and the Church has understood his words, and has never failed to present their truth and their practice to men.

The murmurs of the Jews had caused Jesus to digress from the main theme to silence their mutterings. At the forty-eighth verse he returns again to the main theme, and he repeats

the fundamental position which he had equivalently stated before: "I am the Bread of life." This is the motive of the entire discourse. The entire argument was aimed to establish this great truth. We believe that the main idea in Christ's mind in enunciating this proposition was to speak of himself as the object of faith, but this did not exclude the idea of the Eucharist, for Jesus Christ and the Eucharist are not two beings, but one and the same being, and the Eucharist is a means of making Jesus Christ an object of faith in the soul of man.

In the forty-ninth and fiftieth verses a comparison is again instituted between the manna in the wilderness and Jesus Christ. Expositors differ widely in explaining these verses. The chief source of difficulty is to fix the exact concept on which is based the excellence of the bread of life over the manna. We believe that the comparison is based on the effects of the two beings in the following manner. The manna had not efficacy to sustain man's spiritual life. It alimented his body for a time, and then all who ate it died. The manna, by the powers of its nature, could not do more than satisfy the body's hunger for a time. But Christ, the bread of life, gives and sustains man's eternal life. Now it may be objected that some of those who ate the manna have attained eternal life, such as Moses and Joshua; and that some who eat of the bread of life of the New Testament do not obtain eternal life. This is readily answered: no man ever obtained eternal life in virtue of the eating of the manna: its effect was merely to support the body for a time. But the bread of life of itself has an eternal effect; and they who receive it, and yet die the spiritual death, die thus because they dispose themselves in such manner that the intrinsic power of the bread of life is unable to act upon them. The manna was the bread from heaven of the Old Testament; Christ is the bread of the New Testament. Now by this comparison Christ teaches them the excellence of the new order of things over the old. The manna belonged to the category of material foods; the eating of it did not affect the eternal life of man. But Christ, the true bread from Heaven, has in himself the power of giving a man eternal life, eternal life for the soul, and eternal life for the body, when it shall arise, and put on incorruption. And if any man fails to receive this effect,

he fails not through the weakness of the bread of life, but because he chooses to deprive himself of the effect of that life-giving food.

Not only is this declaration true in its positive sense, but it is true also in its negative sense; that is to say, no man can have eternal life except through Christ, the bread of life. As the universe was made through him, so the universe must be saved by him. The supreme evil that can befall man is eternal death; beside that awful hopeless evil all other evils fade into insignificance. And against that terrible evil there is one sure defense, one means of absolute safety, and that is "to put on the Lord Jesus Christ"; to believe in him, hope in him, and love him with all our hearts; and to observe all things whatsoever he commands through his Church till the end of time.

No message that can be communicated to man can mean so much as this one statement: "Thou shalt not die." Upon the first parents of all men, and upon all men through them the fearful sentence was passed by God: "Ye shall surely die." No man can doubt of the universality of that decree: "Unto all men death did pass, for that all have sinned." These are terrible words, and if they were not relieved by any brighter message, they would blot out all hope out of man's life. But from Heaven comes another voice, the voice of the Redeemer: "This is the Bread which cometh down out of Heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and not die. I am the living bread which came down out of Heaven; if any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever." Bread which came down out of Heaven, because the Word was made flesh; *living* bread, because it has in itself the power to give life, eternal life to those who eat thereof. Behold the revocation of that awful sentence of death; and behold the means, and the only means of having life, eternal life. O, that man would cast out of his mind all other thoughts and interests, that the thought of the life which comes through Christ might alone live in the book and volume of his brain!

It must be remarked here that the verse which in the numeration of the Greek text is fifty-first, is divided in the Vulgate into fifty-first and fifty-second, so that the chapter according to the Greek text is composed of seventy-one

verses, while the Vulgate assigns seventy-two. The numeration of the verses of Scripture is a purely human work; and we prefer to follow the numeration of the Greek text.

In the second member of the fifty-first verse, the Lord plainly expresses a promise of that sacramental mode of being that he the bread of life will take, in order to give himself to men. The Lord Jesus would be the bread of life, and all the chapter up this point could have been uttered by the Lord, even if he did not institute the Blessed Sacrament. Indeed, Maldonatus asserts that, if the institution of the Eucharist had not taken place at the Last Supper, we could explain the whole chapter of faith in Christ. But we believe that, if the Lord Jesus had not in mind to institute the Eucharist, he would never have uttered the declaration recorded in the second member of the fifty-first verse.

Neither is there here a complete change of subject. The subject is the same, the Lord Jesus Christ, the bread of life. The act by which we receive the effect of this bread of life is the same, the living faith in Jesus Christ. It is not the body's act of eating that benefits us in the Eucharist. It is the soul's act of living faith in him who is not *in* the Eucharist, but who *is* the Eucharist. Of course, we do not mean to say that to believe in the Eucharist is the same as to receive the Eucharist. Jesus Christ worthily received in the Eucharist operates a special effect upon those who receive him, and the formal cause of that special effect is his reception in the Eucharist; but in that act of receiving Christ in his sacramental mode of being the formal element that makes it a supreme act of worship is faith in Jesus Christ whom we receive.

Christ's sacramental mode of being will not be eternal: it is simply a mode of being employed here to enable man to come closer to the source of life.

Now although it is not of faith that Jesus speaks of the Eucharist in the fifty-first and the following verses, nevertheless it is the persuasion of the Catholic people, and it was evidently the belief of the Fathers of Trent, as appears from the following documents. In the Thirteenth Session of the Council of Trent, Chapter II., De Eucharistia, this statement occurs: "Our Saviour wished this Sacrament to be taken as a

spiritual food of souls, by which they are nourished and strengthened, living the life of him who has said: 'He that eateth me, he also shall live because of me.' " Now though there is no definition of the sense of St. John's text here, it is evident that the Fathers of Trent considered the quoted words of Jesus as spoken by him concerning the Eucharist.

Again in the Twenty-first Session, Chapter I., De Communionem, the Fathers of Trent make use of the sixth chapter of John to prove the sufficiency of Holy Communion under one form: "But neither from the discourse in John VI. can it be rightly inferred that Communion under both forms is prescribed by the Lord; in whatever way, according to the various expositions of Fathers and doctors, that text may be understood. For he who said: 'Except ye shall eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye shall not have life in yourselves,' said also: 'He that eateth this bread shall live forever.' And he who said: 'He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life,' said also: 'The bread which I will give is my flesh for the life of the world.' And finally, he who said: 'He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood abideth in me, and I in him,' said also: 'He that eateth this bread shall live for ever.'" The whole argument of the Fathers would be irrelevant and foolish, unless the sense of the passages quoted pertains to the Eucharist. Of course, it is not equivalent to the denying that Jesus is really present in the Eucharist, to deny that the Eucharist is promised in the sixth chapter of St. John. The proper place to treat thoroughly of the Eucharist is in the commentary on the words of institution used at the Last Supper. But inasmuch as the idea of that future institution was in Christ's mind in this present discourse, and inasmuch as that same idea becomes the leading thought in several verses of the present chapter, we can not pass over the text without expounding this clear sense. We believe therefore that the portion of the discourse of Jesus comprised between the second member of the fifty-first verse and the fifty-eighth verse inclusively contains an explicit promise of the Eucharist, and explains the nature of the same sacrament.

It is evident to all that there is a change of phraseology at the second member of the fifty-first verse. Up to that point Jesus had been speaking of something which he actually was at that time; of something which the Father had already given to the world. But at the aforesaid point Jesus changes the manner of his discourse, and speaks of something future, something that he *will give*. Certainly by this expression Christ speaks of assuming some relation to the world which he had not yet assumed. Now this marked difference in phraseology would be inexplicable if Jesus continues to speak of himself only as the bread of life which the soul receives by the act of faith. Again, it is incongruous to believe that Jesus, if he were proposing himself only as an object of the act of faith, should specify his flesh and his blood as such object. When, in the preceding verses, he proposes himself in a purely spiritual sense as the object of faith, he does not say: "My flesh is the Bread of life," but: "I am the Bread of life." Wherefore, since he does not speak of himself as the object of man's act of faith, but only of his *flesh*, it seems reasonable that he speaks of that peculiar act by which his glorified flesh is eaten sacramentally in the Eucharist. Of course, Christ entire is in the Eucharist; but by the words of consecration only his flesh is placed there; his blood and soul are there in virtue of that natural connection and concomitance by which these parts of Christ, who has arisen and who dieth no more, are united: his Divinity is there in virtue of its hypostatic union with Christ's body and soul. The Eucharistic bread therefore mystically signifies only the body of Christ; and the Eucharistic wine mystically signifies only his blood. It is evident that Christ spoke of them in this sense, and thus considered they are the object of the acts of eating and of drinking.

Moreover Christ speaks of *giving* a bread. Certainly Christ here speaks of doing some future thing. It could not be the constituting of himself as the object of the world's faith, for that was not a future thing: he *was* that.

We must admit that there is another way of explaining these words without seeing in them the promise of the Eucharist. Cajetan asserts that the Lord thereby declares that he will give his body to suffer on the cross for the redemption of

the world. Jansenius of Ghent also gives it as his opinion that the Lord means that men must believe in his flesh which was given unto death on the cross for us, and that by such faith we eat his flesh. Neither of the doctors deny the doctrine of transubstantiation, but they deny that it is promulgated in the present text. Now we grant that the Lord had in mind the sacrifice of the Cross in enunciating the proposition which is under our present consideration. The Eucharist is an everlasting memorial of the sufferings and death of Jesus.

Certainly the more prominent thought in the discourse of Christ is the Vicarious Atonement. The "life of the world" in St. John's text is the effect of the great sacrifice of Christ's death. When Christ says, "and the bread which I will give is my flesh, for the life of the world," he primarily means that he will give his body to be crucified as an atoning sacrifice for the life of the world. He speaks of himself as bread, because he is contrasting the great spiritual food with the common bread which the Jews had eaten in the desert. If there had been no further discourse of Christ regarding the Eucharist, and if he had not given to the Apostles the Last Supper, the Eucharist would not be very clearly revealed in Scripture. But we must interpret the present text in the light of Jesus' words and deeds at the Last Supper, and also according to the analogy of the faith which the infallible Church teaches us. In that light we see two allied truths in the present discourse of Christ. The "life of the world" is first the effect of the Crucifixion, but it is at the same time the effect of the communion of Christ's body and blood which is an everlasting memorial and renewal of the sacrifice of Calvary.

When Jesus commands men to eat his flesh and drink his blood he first contemplates that act of faith by which men become united to Christ by a vital connection so that life flows into them from their head who is Christ. But Christ also contemplates that mode of being which he shall assume in the Eucharist, and that partaking of the body and blood of Christ by which men come into the closest union with Christ. Christ did not complete the teaching of the Eucharist here. He gives only a veiled promise. He promises two things: he promises to give his body to die on the cross, and he promises

to institute the Eucharist. The death on the Cross is the formal cause of the Eucharist, for St. Paul says: "For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come." To justify such language the bread and the cup of the Eucharist must be more than symbols. Jesus Christ as the eternal, unchanging God, and Author of life and grace first proposes himself in his absolute being as the source of the soul's life. He describes his vivifying effect under the figure of the alimentation of food. And inasmuch as Christ had determined to give himself to men in the sacramental mode of being, he aptly chose expressions which signify the great act of faith and the communion of Christ's body and blood. The words of institution of the Blessed Eucharist at the Last Supper are fashioned to agree with the promise here made, and they fulfill the promise of Christ.

The Jews understood the words of Jesus in the second half of the fifty-first verse literally. In this they rightly understood them. But they understood them too literally, too grossly; they understood the Lord to speak of the eating of flesh, as the flesh of beasts is eaten. It was an everlasting tenet of the Mosaic Law that every Jew should abstain from blood; and yet this man spoke of their drinking his blood. How could it be? and they fell to arguing among themselves.

A man who had fed over five thousand people with five loaves and two fishes; a man who had by a word stilled the tempest on the sea; a man who had healed all manner of disease, and raised the dead, merited faith in his words, even when men could not understand them. The words of Jesus were deep and mysterious: the plain duty of those who heard them was humbly to acknowledge that the sense of the words was incomprehensible, and to ask for light to know as much as it is necessary to know. But instead of thus approaching Jesus, they endeavor to apprehend the works of faith by the mere power of human reason. They failed, and every man who endeavors to do that same thing shall fail. You can not light up the universe with a candle, neither can you comprehend God's works by the weak light of human reason. The spirit in which the Jews entered into discussion of Jesus' words deprived them of the necessary divine help for the understanding of his discourse.

On a former occasion Jesus had expounded to Nicodemus the doctrine of baptism as a second birth. The Jew had understood birth as a coming forth from the womb, and had also expressed his inability to comprehend Jesus' words: "How can a man be born when he is old? can he enter a second time into his mother's womb and be born?" And Jesus straightway taught him that he spoke of a spiritual birth. But the spirit that actuated Nicodemus was different from that of the assembly at Capharnaum, who listened to the discourse on the bread of life. Nicodemus needed an introduction into the unknown world of spirit, but his heart was docile. The hearts of those in the synagogue at Capharnaum were gross, carnal, and disobedient; and Jesus left them in their blindness. And to show them that the truth at which they staggered could not be modified, he repeats his proposition with still greater emphasis, and makes it the absolute condition of eternal life.

In his "Lectures on the Holy Eucharist," Cardinal Wiseman institutes an argument upon the words of Jesus, and the argument proceeds in this manner: The expression, "to eat the flesh of Christ" must be taken either figuratively or literally. If it is taken figuratively it must have been used in the "fixed, proverbial, unvarying metaphorical signification" which the phrase had among the people addressed. Now it is discovered from an examination of the phraseology of the Bible, and from a study of the language which Jesus spoke, that the expression when used metaphorically means to do a person some serious injury, principally by calumny or false accusation. In Psalm XXVII. 2 [Vulg. XXVI.], we read: "When evil doers came upon me to eat my flesh." In Job XIX. 22, we read: "Why do ye persecute me as God, and are not satisfied with my flesh?" Again in Job XXXI. 31: "Verily the men of my tent said: Who will give us of his flesh? we are not satisfied."

Some obscurity invests this latter text, and our translation of it is not the one usually given; but we are persuaded from the general plan of Job's argument that it is in substance correct, although we have freely rendered the harsh Hebrew idiom to make it intelligible. A remarkable specimen of the wrong application of Scripture is the use of this passage from

the Book of Job in the Office of the Blessed Sacrament in the Roman Breviary, in the first response of the second nocturn.

The prophet Micah speaks of the rulers of Israel as those "who also eat the flesh of my people." In Ecclesiastes IV. 5, the effect of the vice of envy is described as follows: "The fool foldeth his arms together, and eateth his own flesh."

The conclusion which Cardinal Wiseman draws from his argument is thus expressed in his own words:

"The conclusion, from all that I have said, is obvious. Whether we consult the phraseology of Scripture, the spirit and ideas of the Semitic nations, or the current use of the language employed by our Saviour, the expression to *eat the flesh of a person*, had an established metaphorical meaning. The phrase, therefore, could not be used metaphorically, in any other sense; so that if the hearers found themselves compelled to fly from its literal meaning, and take refuge in a figurative interpretation, so long as they had to interpret words and phrases by the *only* meanings which they had ever heard given to them, they could only recur to this. Nor is it consistent with the first elements of civilized society, of good intentions, nay, of common sense, for any speaker to use forms of language, having established and conventional significations, in a sense never before heard, noways intelligible from the nature of the phrases, and unattainable by any conjecture which might be expected from the habits, feelings, or ideas of those to whom they are addressed.

"While, therefore, upon a minute analysis of the expressions used in the former part of the discourse, we discovered that every phrase, as in common use among the Jews, was adapted to convey the doctrine there taught, and so our Saviour explained himself, we have no less discovered that the phrases used in the second portion never could have the same meaning, consequently that a transition must have taken place to another subject. Furthermore, we have seen that the phrases used in the latter portion were such as left the hearers, and consequently us, no choice between the literal sense, and an established metaphorical one of *calumniating* our Saviour. This must instantly be rejected, nor has any one ever so much

as thought of it; and we must therefore conclude that our Lord, after the forty-eighth verse, teaches the necessity of really eating his body and drinking his blood.”—Wiseman, l. c.

Now having in mind to defend the same truth which Wiseman defends, we must confess that we do not find the great cardinal’s argument conclusive. He constructs a dilemma with two horns: The Lord’s discourse must be literal or metaphorical. It can not be metaphorical; therefore it must be literal. The proofs that we have already adduced do in fact prove that the ordinary metaphorical signification of the phrase under consideration was to do evil to a person, especially by calumny. But suppose we retort the argument in this manner: In all the languages of men the phrase to eat the flesh of a creature in the literal sense means to eat it as the flesh of slaughtered animals is eaten for food. There is no precedent in human speech for the sense in which Christ used the term. He was speaking of a new mode of being which, as the Council of Trent says, we can scarcely express in human speech. Not one of Christ’s hearers at the time that he spoke, could have had any conception of that mysterious new mode of being. The words of Christ can not be taken in the ordinary literal sense; this was the error of the Jews, and they shuddered at the thought of eating human flesh. The words of Christ must be taken in an *extraordinary* literal sense, to fit the new mode of being which the power of God was to create. Now this *extraordinary* literal sense is farther removed from the *ordinary* literal sense than an *extraordinary* metaphorical sense would have been from the ordinary metaphorical sense. For in every case, we must admit an extraordinary sense; and the preceding discourse of Jesus would help us somewhat to understand an extraordinary figurative sense; for after all, the transition from receiving Jesus as the Bread of life by the act of faith to eating his flesh and drinking his blood is not so very violent, when we consider it as a climax of the whole discourse. Wherefore the argumentation of Wiseman only serves to prove that Jesus could not have used the aforesaid phrase in an ordinary metaphorical sense, and therefore it really helps in nowise the Catholic exposition; for as we have seen, it would be far easier to explain the words in an extraordinary figurative

sense than in the extraordinary literal sense to which we must appeal. We believe that Catholic doctrine is not benefitted by straining texts of Scripture to draw from them more than they contain. The clearer words of institution at the Last Supper and the authority of the Church move us to see in the sixth chapter of St. John the promise of the Eucharist. When we know from these clearer sources the doctrine of the Eucharist, it is easy for us to choose, of the several significations which Jesus' present words might have had, the particular sense which they did have. But it is not true that this is the only sense which such words could have had.

Hence we do not say that the sixth chapter of St. John is the great classic text to prove the Real Presence in the Eucharist; it is a text which by the analogy of faith we explain to contain the promise of the Eucharist, which Jesus afterwards in clearer terms instituted.

A question of some importance arises out of the fifty-third verse, wherein Jesus makes the eating of his flesh and the drinking of his blood the absolute condition of life. On the authority of this verse the Greeks give the Eucharist to infants immediately after their baptism. But Catholic doctrine admits to salvation baptized infants, and children who have not received Holy Communion, and it also admits to salvation catechumens who die before they are admitted to the participation of the Lord's Supper.

Much has been written to reconcile the seeming discrepancy between the Lord's words and the belief and practice of the Church. Cajetan's explanation is especially lame. He says: "To eat sacramentally supposes the ability to eat naturally; therefore infants have not the obligation of eating sacramentally, since they can not eat naturally." But even if we grant this, it does not solve the difficulty. The child of five, six, or seven years, eats naturally; and yet we do not admit it to Holy Communion; and if it dies in its baptismal innocence, we know that it is saved. And *a fortiori* this will apply to the catechumen.

We find a certain parallelism between this universal proposition concerning the Eucharist, and that other universal proposition recorded in John III. 5: "Verily, verily, I say

unto you: Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." Both passages refer to necessary sacraments; and both make the reception of their respective sacraments the absolute condition of eternal life. Yet we have seen that the new birth by the Holy Ghost is wider in its application than the actual baptism by water. The new birth is absolutely universal; the baptism by water is only universal in the ordinary economy. Now we apply the same method of reasoning to the universal proposition "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye shall not have life in yourselves." Christ has not absolutely bound his power to the sacraments in such way that he can not act independently of them in cases of necessity. Jesus Christ as the source of all spiritual life, as sole mediator between God and man, exercises a more universal power than the effect of the Eucharist. Without Jesus Christ in his absolutely universal character, no man can be saved, be he infant, catechumen, savage, or antediluvian. Now the Eucharist is a special ineffable mode of being, instituted by Christ for the purpose of transmitting to men the life which comes from Christ. It is necessary to receive the Eucharist, as theologians say, not *necessitate medii sed necessitate præcepti divini*. That is to say, the necessity of receiving the Eucharist does not arise from the nature of the sacrament itself; but such necessity arises from the precept of God; and this obligation binds man to receive the Holy Eucharist often in life, and at the hour of death. That the necessity of receiving the Sacrament does not arise from the Sacrament itself is clear; for grace can come from Christ through other sources; in fact, it is necessary to be in the state of grace to receive worthily the Eucharist.

In the light of this doctrine we can explain the sense of the fifty-third verse of John. The verse establishes the absolute necessity, *necessitas medii*, of being united to him who is the *res et virtus* of the Eucharist, in order to obtain eternal life. It also establishes an obligation arising from the very precept of Christ to receive actually Christ in the Eucharistic form, if one is morally able. Hence, in this sense the words convey a precept binding all those who have come to the use of reason, and who are able to receive the Eucharist. Jesus

Christ operates through the Eucharist, and outside of the Eucharist. The Eucharist is a channel of grace, and a necessary channel of grace in the ordinary economy. Christ's causality is wider in its range than the causality of the sacraments; but he will not employ this extraordinary mode of operating on those who reject the Eucharist or neglect it. If a Catholic were cast away on a desert island, he could be saved without the Eucharist, but not without him who is the Eucharist. The words of Christ therefore are equivalent to the saying: "Except ye have faith in me, even to the acceptance of the doctrine of the Eucharist, and even to the receiving of my body and of my blood, as I shall exist in that sacramental mode of being, ye shall not have life in yourselves." No man can wilfully reject the doctrine of the Eucharist, or culpably neglect to receive it, and have eternal life.

In the fifty-fourth verse the effect of the Eucharist is made identical with the effect of faith in Christ; for the Eucharist is Christ, and the worthy reception of it is the greatest act of faith in Christ.

On the authority of the Greek codices, we render the fifty-fifth verse: "For my flesh is true meat and my blood is true drink." By this declaration Christ first declares that he operates on the believing soul, and gives life and vigor to that soul as food gives strength to our bodies. And Christ also affirms thereby, that the Eucharist is not a mere type or symbol, but a real supernatural food which operates in its own high order of being an effect like to that which food and drink do for the body. The good effects of the Eucharist are not wrought by the subjective acts of the communicant, although these are necessary. The Eucharist by its own intrinsic power feeds and nourishes the better part of the man in whom these good dispositions are found.

It is a remarkable fact that after the Jews had expressed their inability to comprehend how Jesus was to give them his flesh to eat, Jesus repeats the same truth many times with all the emphasis of which human speech seems capable. Nay more, instead of the milder verb *φαγεῖν*, which he had thus far employed, Jesus employs the term *τρώγων* from the verb *τρώγω*, which properly means to gnaw, to chew; to eat raw vegetables,

fruit, etc., opposed to eating dressed food. It is certain that by this phraseology Jesus gives proof that he will not pare down and temper his declaration to take away the cause of stumbling from the Jews. But on the contrary, even in the face of their disputing and unbelief, he intensifies the emphasis of the declaration which had puzzled all his hearers. Certainly the opponents of the Eucharist must admit that, had Jesus wished to promulgate the doctrine of transubstantiation, he could not have done so in clearer, stronger terms than those here employed.

From the fact that Christ said nothing to reconcile the Jews to the sense of his words Cardinal Wiseman proceeds to draw what he calls the most important proof of the Real Presence. We insert the long argument in his own words:

"I say, then, that whenever our Lord's hearers found difficulties, or raised objections to his words, from taking them in their literal sense, while he intended them to be taken figuratively, his constant practice was to explain them instantly in a figurative manner, even though no great error could result from their being misunderstood. The first example which I shall give, is a well-known conversation between our Saviour and Nicodemus. 'Jesus answered and said to him: Amen, amen, I say to thee, unless a man be *born again*, he cannot enter the kingdom of God.' This expression was one in ordinary use, among the Jewish doctors, to express proselytism. Nicodemus, whether from wilfulness or error, took the words in their literal import, and made an objection precisely similar in form to that of the Jews: 'How *can* a man be born when he is old?' Our Saviour instantly explains the words in their figurative meaning to him, by repeating them with such a modification as could leave no farther doubt of the sense in which he spoke them: 'Amen, amen, I say to thee, unless a man be born again of *water* and the *Holy Ghost*, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.'

"Matt. XVI. 6. Jesus said to his disciples: 'Take heed and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees.' They took his words literally: 'But they thought within themselves, saying: Because we have taken no bread.' But Jesus lost no time in correcting the mistake, [v. 11]: 'Why do you

not understand that it is not concerning bread I said to you, Beware,' etc. 'Then they understood that he said not that they should beware of the leaven of bread, but of the doctrine of the Pharisees and Sadducees.' This remarkable example of our Saviour's care not to be misunderstood becomes much more interesting when we view it in reference to another passage in St. Luke, [Chap. XII. 1.] There we have a discourse of our Lord, which all the harmonists agree in placing long after that of St. Matthew. Our Divine Master wished to employ before the crowds the same figure as we have just heard; but he had perceived that it was not easily understood, and he therefore adds the explanation: 'Beware ye of the leaven of the Pharisees; which is hypocrisy.'

"Jo. XV. 32. Jesus said to his disciples: 'I have food to eat which you know not.' They erroneously took his words literally; and he lost no time in explaining them figuratively. 'The disciples, therefore, said to one another: Hath any man brought him any thing to eat? Jesus saith to them: My food is to do the will of him that sent me.'

"Jo. XI. 11 is a similar instance, and important, because our Saviour is not even engaged upon doctrinal matters. He said to the Apostles: 'Lazarus, our friend, sleepeth.' Mistaking his meaning, by understanding him literally, they reply; 'Lord, if he sleepeth, he will do well. But Jesus spoke of his death, and they thought that he spoke of the repose of sleep. Then, *therefore, Jesus said to them plainly: Lazarus is dead.*'

"Matt. XIX. 24. The disciples understood literally his words, 'that it is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of Heaven,' so as to conclude that salvation was absolutely incompatible with wealth. Jesus loses no time in removing their error by telling them that, 'with men this is impossible, but with God all things are possible.'

"Jo. VIII. 21. Jesus said: 'Whither I go, you cannot come.' The Jews took his words in a gross material sense, and asked: 'Will he kill himself, that he saith: Whither I go, you cannot come?' Jesus, with the greatest meekness, removes this absurd interpretation of his words: 'You are from beneath, I am from above; you are of this world, I am not of this world.'

“Ibid. v. 32. He tells the Jews, that the truth should make them free. They take his words literally, and raise an objection accordingly: ‘We are the seed of Abraham, and we have never been slaves to any man; how sayest thou: You shall be free?’ He once more interrupts his discourse to contradict this erroneous interpretation, by replying, that he spoke of a spiritual slavery: ‘Amen, amen, I say unto you, that whosoever committeth sin, is the servant of sin—if therefore the Son shall make you free [of sin], ye shall be free indeed.’

“Ibid. v. 40. Jesus observes, that if the Jews were children of Abraham, they would do the works of Abraham; but that, instead of this, they acted in a totally opposite manner, and thereby did the deeds of their father. They understood him to say literally, that they were not the legitimate descendants of their patriarch, and replied accordingly: ‘We are not born of fornication.’ Jesus, without hesitation, explains his meaning of their spiritual descent, however harsh it might appear [v. 44.]: ‘You are of your father, the devil, and the desires of your father you will do.’

“Jo. VI. 33. In fine, in the very discourse which forms the subject of all our inquiries, we have another, and a striking instance of our Saviour’s constant practice. Jesus having said that ‘the bread of God is that which cometh down from Heaven, and giveth life to the world,’ his hearers take his words literally, contrary to his intentions, and say to him: ‘Lord, give us always this bread.’ True to his rule of action, Jesus explains himself spiritually: ‘I am the bread of life; he that cometh to me shall not hunger; and he that believeth in me shall not thirst.’

“From these examples, three whereof, like that under discussion, refer to images drawn from food, we may, I think, deduce a very certain corollary or canon; that whenever our Saviour’s expressions were erroneously taken in their literal sense, and he meant them to be figurative, it was his constant practice instantly to explain himself, and let his audience understand that his words were to be taken figuratively. The eighth chapter of St. John, from which I have quoted three examples, is a striking proof, that even when malice and per-

verseness were the sources of misinterpretation, he was not to be wearied out by its repeated recurrence, but undeviatingly adhered to this mild, prudent, and conciliating rule of ever correcting the misapprehensions of his audience.

“Let us now examine our Saviour’s practice in the opposite case. Secondly, therefore, I say, that when his words were *rightly* understood in their literal sense, and by that correct interpretation gave rise to murmurs or objections, it was his custom to stand to his words, and repeat again the very sentiment which had given the offence. The following instances well demonstrate this rule.

“Matt. IX. 2. ‘Jesus said to the man sick of the palsy: Son, be of good heart, thy sins are forgiven thee.’ The hearers took these words in their literal meaning, and were right in doing so; still they expressed their displeasure with them, saying: ‘This man blasphemeth.’ Our Lord does not abate the least in the expression, which, being rightly understood, had caused the objections, but in his answer repeats it again and again. ‘Which is easier to say: *Thy sins are forgiven thee*, or to say: Rise up and walk. But that you may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to *forgive* sins,’ etc.

“Jo. VIII. 56. Our Redeemer said to the Jews: ‘Abraham your father rejoiced that he might see my day: he saw it, and was glad.’ His auditors *correctly* took his words in their literal import, as equivalent to an assertion that he was coeval with Abraham; and they murmured accordingly. ‘The Jews then said to him: Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham?’ Our Saviour, though he foresaw that personal violence would be the consequence of his conduct, did not seek to modify his words, but exactly repeated with his usual intrepidity the very sentiment which had caused so much offence. ‘Jesus said to them: Amen, amen, I say unto you, before Abraham was made, I am.’ Thus does the eighth chapter of St. John afford us marked exemplification of our blessed Redeemer’s manner of acting in both cases, when rightly and when erroneously understood to speak in the literal sense.

“Jo. VI. 42. Once more, the very chapter under discussion affords us a striking example of this rule. Our Saviour

having said that he had come down from Heaven, is correctly understood, yet murmured against. 'And they said: Is not this Jesus, whose father and mother we know? How then saith he: I came down from Heaven?' He acts in his usual manner. As they had understood him rightly, he cares not for the objection; but having premised the reasons why they did not believe in him, goes on, in the second part of his discourse, to repeat again and again the very phrase which had caused complaint, by saying that he came down from Heaven.

"The two rules, then, are sufficiently clear; when his hearers, *misunderstanding* his words, raise objections, Jesus *explains* them; when *understanding* them *right*, they find fault, he *repeats* them. In order, therefore, to discover whether the Jews understood our Saviour wrong or right in our case, we have only to look at his answer to their objection, and see whether he explains his previous words, as in the eleven instances I first brought, or repeats the obnoxious expressions, as in the three last cases which I quoted. The answer to this question is sufficiently clear. In his answer, our Saviour repeats the same words *five times*, and in phrases which add energy to his previous expressions."—Wiseman op. cit. pp. III—III9.

Now without intending to weaken the force of Wiseman's reasoning, we must confess that this present argument does not seem to us entirely convincing. We admit that Jesus' emphatic repetition of his declaration in the face of the mutterings and contradictions of the Jews is a proof, but it seems to us that the cardinal's argument is not convincing, in which he strives to prove that the Jews must have understood Jesus rightly from the fact that Jesus does not explain his words. We hold with Cardinal Manning that the Jews understood Jesus' words literally, but we deny that they understood them aright. The Jews understood Jesus to speak of the eating of flesh and the drinking of blood as men might be conceived to eat the flesh and drink the blood of slaughtered animals. This was the only literal sense that they could have known at that time. The Eucharist was a mode of being of Jesus Christ which could not possibly have come into their minds; and though it is a literal sense of Jesus' words, it is a literal sense that they

could not have known then, and that we should never have known, had Jesus not made the truth clearer by his subsequent words of institution and by the infallible teaching of the Church. The new ineffable mode of being necessitates the use of language in a sense that has no precedent in human language. No man has a right to demand of Jesus a present understanding of all mysteries. The Jews should have believed, and waited for the revelation, which would come in God's time. Inasmuch as they were not docile, but on the contrary rebellious and unbelieving, Jesus gives them no explanation of his mysterious words.

Again, it is recorded in John, II. 18-22, that when the Jews asked Jesus by what authority he drove the tradesmen from the temple, Jesus answered: "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up." Now Jesus spoke there of the temple of his body, and the Jews understood him to speak of the material temple at Jerusalem. The Jews retained this erroneous understanding of Jesus' words even to the end, and based upon this statement one of the grave charges at his final trial. And Jesus allows them to persist in their error, because they merited not to know the truth, and because the full truth could not at that time be presented to the world.

Cardinal Wiseman attempts to answer this objection, but we are forced to admit that his answers are not convincing.

We believe therefore that we can not strengthen the doctrine of the Real Presence by an argument drawn from the sole fact that Jesus did not explain his words to the Jews.

In the fifty-sixth and fifty-seventh verses, the process is beautifully described by which the Eucharist gives life to man. There is an everlasting union between the Eternal Father and the Son, because the Son is equal to the Father and identical in nature with him. Therefore the life of the Father is the life of the Son. Now by that act of union which consists in the worthy reception of the Eucharist, we are so closely united to Jesus Christ that his life becomes our life, and he lives in us, and we live by his life. The branch lives because it is united to the trunk, and receives the vital sap from the trunk. It has not an independent source of life in itself. If it is severed from the trunk it will die. So it is with man. He has not an inde-

pendent source of the supernatural in himself, but draws his life from Christ. Sever man from the source of life in Christ, and he will die.

The following teaching which we excerpt from Wiseman, l. c., is applicable here: "Whenever in any law, or promise in Scripture, or elsewhere, rewards or consequences are mentioned, the simple term, expressive of the act to be done, always essentially signifies that act *as duly done*. When faith is mentioned as having rewards attached to it, a real, a sincere faith, a faith working by charity, is always implied, for 'the devils also believe and tremble.' When it is said that all who believe and are baptized shall be saved, much, surely, is understood relative to the proper dispositions. When efficacy is attributed to the sacrifices of the Old Law, we have no difficulty in understanding that this depended upon the interior feelings of repentance, gratitude, or humility, which accompanied them. The law, in short, always supposes the act well performed, and so it is, of course, with the law of the Eucharist."

In all the universe there is nothing more precious than life. And nothing is worthy to be called life except the eternal life. And yet man devotes the high powers of his nature to the mean little issues of time, and neglects this great possession. He thinks much and labors much to insure to himself other things, but for the life that endureth forever he thinks and labors but little or not at all.

The fifty-eighth verse is identical in sense with the fiftieth verse, because the Eucharist in nature and effect is identical with Jesus Christ.

This is the wondrous discourse which Jesus delivered in the synagogue of Capharnaum after the multiplication of the loaves and fishes. The fullness of its sense could not be understood by the people at that time. But Jesus has merited that men shall receive his words, even though they may not fully understand them. The men of Judæa ought to have kept Jesus' words in their hearts, and to have waited for the clearer revelation that came afterward. There were many words of Jesus and many events in his life which Mary did not understand at first; but she kept all these things in her heart, and waited for the revelation, and in due time it came. And so

should we act. "For we know in part, and we prophesy in part: but when that which is perfect is come, that which is in part shall be done away. . . . Now I know in part; but then shall I know even as I have been known."—I. Cor. XIII. 9, 12.

JOHN VI. 60—71.

60. Many therefore of his disciples, when they heard this said: This is a hard saying; who can hear it?

61. But Jesus knowing in himself that his disciples murmured at this, said unto them: Doth this cause you to stumble?

62. What then if ye should behold the Son of man ascending where he was before?

63. It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I have spoken unto you are spirit, and are life.

64. But there are some of you that believe not. For Jesus knew from the beginning who they were that believed not, and who it was that should betray him.

65. And he said: For this cause have I said unto you, that no man can come unto me, except it be given unto him of the Father.

66. Upon this many of his disciples went back, and walked no more with him.

67. Jesus said therefore unto the twelve: Would ye also go away?

60. Πολλοὶ οὖν ἀκούσαντες ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ, εἶπον: Σκληρός ἐστιν ὁ λόγος οὗτος: τίς δύναται αὐτοῦ ἀκοῦειν;

61. Εἰδὼς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν ἑαυτῷ ὅτι γογγύζουσιν περὶ τούτου οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, εἶπεν αὐτοῖς: Τοῦτο ὑμᾶς σκανδαλίζει;

62. Ἐὰν οὖν θεωρῇτε τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀναβαίνοντα ὅπου ἦν τὸ πρότερον;

63. Τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστιν τὸ ζῶοποιον, ἡ σὰρξ οὐκ ὠφελεῖ οὐδέν, τὰ ρήματα ἃ ἐγὼ λαλάληκα ὑμῖν, πνεῦμά ἐστιν καὶ ζωὴ ἐστιν.

64. Ἄλλ' εἰσὶν ἐξ ὑμῶν τινὲς οἳ οὐ πιστεύουσιν, ἦδει γὰρ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, τίνες εἰσὶν οἱ μὴ πιστεύοντες, καὶ τίς ἐστιν ὁ παραδώσων αὐτόν.

65. Καὶ ἔλεγεν: Διὰ τοῦτο εἶρηκα ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐδεὶς δύναται ἐλθεῖν πρὸς με, ἐὰν μὴ ἦ δεδομένον αὐτῷ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς.

66. Ἐκ τούτου πολλοὶ ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ ἀπῆλθον εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω, καὶ οὐκέτι μετ' αὐτοῦ περιεπάτουν.

67. Εἶπεν οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοῖς δώδεκα: Μὴ καὶ ὑμεῖς θέλετε ὑπάγειν;

68. Simon Peter answered him: Lord, to whom shall we go? thou hast the words of eternal life.

69. And we have believed and know that thou art the Holy One of God.

70. Jesus answered them: Did not I choose you twelve, and one of you is a devil?

71. Now he spake of Judas the son of Simon Iscariot, for he it was that should betray him, being one of the twelve.

68. Ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ Σίμων Πέτρος: Κύριε, πρὸς τίνα ἀπελευσόμεθα; ρήματα ζωῆς αἰωνίου ἔχεις.

69. Καὶ ἡμεῖς πεπιστεύκαμεν καὶ ἐγνώκαμεν ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ Ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ.

70. Ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Οὐκ ἐγὼ ὑμᾶς τοὺς δώδεκα ἐξελέξαμην, καὶ ἐξ ὑμῶν εἷς διάβολός ἐστιν;

71. Ἐλεγεν δὲ τὸν Ἰουδαν Σίμωνος Ἰσκαριώτου, οὗτος γὰρ ἔμελλεν παραδιδόναι αὐτόν, εἷς ἐκ τῶν δώδεκα.

In the sixty-fourth verse, in the second period of the verse **N**, G, et al. omit the *μή* before *πιστεύοντες*. In Verse sixty-nine, **N**, B, D, L, Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort endorse the reading, ὁ Ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ. This reading is followed by the protestant Revised Edition. C³, Γ, Δ, Λ, Π, et al., have ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ Τίδς τοῦ Θεοῦ. This reading is followed by the Vulgate, Syriac, Armenian, and Gothic versions. In Verse seventy-one Ἰσκαριώτου is the reading of **N**^c, B, C, G, and L. Ἰσκαριώτην is found in Γ, Δ, Λ, et al.

The narration of St. John now turns from a consideration of the effect which the discourse of Jesus had on the whole assembly to a description of its effect on his disciples and Apostles. It is probable, that at this point of the event, Jesus and his Apostles and disciples had withdrawn from the general gathering in the synagogue. Many of the disciples now express their judgment that the words were hard and incredible. They contemplated the eating of flesh as the flesh is sliced off from the carcasses of animals, cooked, and eaten. Such a horrible concept was certainly revolting and incredible. They spoke not their thoughts to Jesus, neither in his hearing; but Jesus the καρδιογνώστης reads their thoughts, and he declares to them: "Doth this cause you to stumble? What then if ye should behold the Son of man ascending where he was before?" The words of Jesus are enunciated in the form of an aposiopesis;

and to complete the thought, words must be supplied from the context. Jesus had asked his disciples to accept, the doctrine of the Real Presence in the Eucharist. They had found such truth hard to believe, and they began to lose faith in the Master whom they had followed, and whose wonderful works they had seen. Jesus knows in himself the state of their minds, and he asks them what will be the condition of their minds when they shall see him ascending into Heaven whence he came.

In the concept of Christ his Resurrection from the dead, and his Ascension into Heaven were greater truths than his Real Presence in the Eucharist. The plan of his argument is simply this: If the lesser truth causes you to stumble, what will ye do in the face of the greater truth?

It is true that all these disciples did not witness the Ascension of Christ; but yet his argument was relevant; for the Apostles were among the ones addressed, and they saw the Ascension of Jesus. Moreover, the Ascension was a visible fact, witnessed by all the Apostles; and a visible fact thus attested could be said to have been witnessed by the whole world.

By the mention of his Ascension Jesus begins to insinuate into the minds of his Apostles and disciples that it is not of the eating of flesh and the drinking of blood as they conceived it, that he has been speaking, but of his body and blood in that glorified state in which the humanity of Jesus united to his Divinity ascended into Heaven. The difficulty of Calvin centered in this point that the glorified body of Jesus, being in Heaven, could not, at the same time, be in the Eucharist in the numberless places where the Eucharist exists on earth. The Council of Trent answers, that though it can hardly be expressed by words, yet the human mind illumined by faith can conceive it as possible to God. And the Council asserts that such has ever been and ever will be the faith of the Catholic Church.

Jesus continues; "It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I have spoken unto you are spirit, and are life. The protestants endeavor to prove by this passage in the discourse of Jesus that the whose discourse

must be explained solely of the act of faith by which Jesus becomes the bread of life. Now if the discourse stood alone by itself, and we had no authentic interpretation, and no analogy of faith to guide us, we could readily grant that the words *might be* thus understood, but this is far from saying that they must be so understood. We come to the Scriptures not to seek from them a doctrine which we do not possess. We have our doctrines and our faith, and we would have them if we never saw the Scriptures. Hence, we come to the Scriptures to open up their sense aided by the light of the saving truths which we hold by faith. The truth of the existence of the Eucharist does not stand or fall as we shall interpret these words of Scripture, or any words of Scripture. Our faith is not bound to any interpretation of these words; our faith is bound to the living teaching authority of the Church. Now we say that since we know that the Eucharist has been instituted, and that it is the body and blood, soul and Divinity of the Lord Jesus, we can interpret the words under consideration according to the analogy of our faith.

Though the disciples understand Jesus to speak in a literal sense; and though he did speak in a literal sense, yet they understood him not aright. He was to give them his body to eat and his blood to drink, but not in the gross sense that they contemplated. The mere eating of flesh by flesh has no spiritual effect. If Jesus Christ gave to the Jews flesh from which the life, and the spirit, and the Divinity had departed, it would profit them nothing. This was the conception that they had of the eating of flesh. But Jesus spoke of giving his flesh, not in its present mortal condition, but his glorified flesh, his flesh united to his soul, his flesh to which his Divinity was inseparably united.

Now the flesh of Jesus in that sublime mode of being does not cease to be his real flesh. But its sublime mode of being takes it out of the range of sensible perception; and men whose souls are immersed in matter, men who are carnal-minded do not understand the nature of the Eucharist; "for the natural (*ψυχικός*) man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him; and he cannot know them, because they are spiritually judged."—I. Cor. II. 14. The

senses can perceive modes of being which are in their order; but when we rise to the high order of the Eucharist, the flesh and its senses profit us nothing. In saying that his words were spirit and life, Jesus means to say that they treat of a high theme, which can not be grasped by the body and its senses; which can not be apprehended by the animal man.

The body in its present state, as it forms the predominant element of the natural man, lives totally in the realm of death. It perceives things that pass away, it feeds on corruptible matter, and it has received its own death-sentence. Christ says that his words treat not of the phenomena of that low state of being. But the spirit of man belongs to the realm of life, it can not die. The future life that is promised to the body will come to it, because after passing through a wondrous change, it shall receive a participation of the life which is proper to that higher state of being. Therefore Christ calls his words "spirit and life." They speak of flesh and blood, but not in the sense in which St. Paul says that "flesh and blood can not inherit the kingdom of God."—I. Cor. XV. 50. They speak of flesh and blood in that high state in which they are no longer subject to death; in that high state in which they not only have life, but give life. It is as though Jesus had said: "Construe my words not in a carnal sense, of the flesh and blood which are the food of death. Such sense of my words profiteth nothing. But understand my words by spiritual perception of a sublime, ineffable mode of being which I shall institute; and if ye thus understand my words, they are life to you; that is to say, they are the source and cause of everlasting life.

When Peter confessed the Divinity of Jesus Christ, Matt. XVI. 17, the Lord answered: "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona; for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father who is in heaven." This is clearly to say that such a high truth as the Divinity of Jesus can not be perceived by the natural man. It must be an act of the spiritual nature of man illumined by the grace of God. So it is regarding the Eucharist. The Jews looked at the sublime words of Jesus from a low fleshly standpoint, and they interpreted them of flesh in that character in which it is mere clay, and a clog on

the spirit; in which it is weak, while the spirit is ready; in which it shall not possess the kingdom of God; and thus considered the flesh profiteth nothing.

But Jesus spoke of flesh in that higher sense in which the chosen witnesses saw it in the person of the risen Lord ascend into Heaven. To understand it in this high sense is the act of the spiritual nature of man, and God must give the power to believe.

The hearts of men were an open book to the Lord Jesus. This fine proof of Jesus' Divinity very forcibly impressed St. John, and he more than the other Evangelists lays stress upon this proof. By that power Jesus knew those of the assembly who believed, and those who did not. He analyzed the secret thoughts of the men, and told them not alone their thoughts but the cause existing in the "deep things of God." He also knew the future treason of Judas, even though Judas at that time did not know his own treason.

Here we come again in presence of that awful mystery, that God knows all things actual and possible, and this foreknowledge does not conflict with human liberty. We can not understand it; but aided by God's grace we can believe it. The world of our belief is larger than that of our understanding; for by faith we hold to an infinite order of things; whereas our understanding is finite and circumscribed like our own nature.

According to St. John, Jesus knew the unbelief of the disciples, and the treason of Judas *from the beginning*. As God he knew these things and all things from the beginning, that is to say, from all eternity. As man he knew the same from the moment that he assumed our nature in the womb.

At this juncture many of the disciples who had thus far followed Jesus left him, and walked no longer with him. The cause of their turning back is evident: they would not accept the doctrine of the Eucharist.

It is very evident that it is not the fact that Jesus had asked the disciples to believe in him that caused them to stumble. He had oft declared himself to be the Son of God, and had declared that men must believe in him in order to be saved. It was then the peculiar conception of eating the flesh

of Jesus that caused the disciples to turn back from Jesus. Now had Jesus meant simply that to eat his flesh and drink his blood was to believe in him, these men would have left Jesus through an error for which they were in nowise responsible. Jesus Christ would have proposed the central truth upon which the life of the world rests in such a strange unnatural form of expression that these men who had followed him thus far could not understand him, and consequently they left the following of him who is the life of the world. Is it compatible with the character of the merciful Lord that he should tantalize men by insisting on such a strange way of propounding a doctrine which these poor men could not understand?

In dealing with the Pharisees in the synagogue, we believe that Jesus was under no obligation of explaining his words. They erred because their hearts were evil; but here the case is different. Jesus is dealing with his disciples, men who have followed him and who have hung upon his words. They are not strong in faith, but it is the spirit of Jesus to help a weak faith. One sentence from Jesus at that juncture would have taken away the cause of stumbling, but Jesus gives it not. Moreover, Jesus had an infinite knowledge of all things; and he therefore knew that his Church would interpret his words of a real act of eating his flesh and drinking his blood. He knew that his faithful followers through all time would interpret his words of the Real Presence in the Eucharist, not through any human motive or bias, but simply because they wish to obey his law, and love him. The persuasion of the Catholic Church is founded on Jesus' words here, and on his clearer words at the Last Supper. It is not conceivable that Jesus, foreseeing all this, should still have insisted on such form of expression, had he meant only thereby to assert the necessity of faith in himself. It is true that men have an obligation to receive Jesus' words, even when they can not understand them. He, being a teacher of the supernatural, must treat of mysteries which man can not comprehend. But, in such cases, the difficulty arises from the nature of the entities themselves; and of course, these can not be changed, simply because man can not understand them. But the mysteries which surround our life, are deep and dark enough without making them still harder

by strange, unnatural forms of expression. Now if we accept the theory that Jesus in his discourses on the bread of life only spoke of himself as the object of the soul's faith, we must admit that he increased the difficulty of believing by needlessly involving the doctrine of a mystery in the most obscure forms of expression. That Jesus Christ in his Incarnation was the Son of God, is a mystery which it requires the help of the Spirit to believe. Would he who spoke as never man spoke, have added to the intrinsic difficulty of this great truth by proposing it in forms of expression unnatural and revolting?

A proof for the Catholic interpretation results, first from the fact that Jesus used such a form of expression, and, secondly, from the fact that, even when many of his disciples are leaving him, he insists on the same form of expression, and in substance bids the Apostles either accept the truth or leave him. It is as though Jesus stood squarely upon that one proposition, and said to the whole world: "I will not change the tenor of these words: accept this truth or die." Now when we consider that these men staggered at these words, not because the words proposed Jesus Christ as the object of the world's faith, but because they proposed the doctrine of eating his flesh by a real act of eating, and of drinking his blood by a real act of drinking, we say that it is absurd to believe that Jesus would have so insisted on the use of a mere figure of speech, when he saw that such heavy consequences followed, and would forever follow.

It is evident from the answer of Peter that the Apostles were perplexed at the strange words of Jesus. But they saw that Jesus would not modify them, even though all men left him. It was a crucial test: men must accept these words or die; and Peter, in the name of all the Apostles, declares to Jesus that they cannot leave him; that he and he alone has the words of eternal life. To say that Jesus has the words of eternal life is equivalent to saying that he alone can teach men the way to eternal life. Peter does not allude to the doctrine of the bread of life. He could not understand it then. But he throws himself fully on faith in Jesus. It is a touching answer. And when the faith of the Apostles had stood this

test, would not the merciful Jesus have consoled even his chosen twelve by a word of explanation, if he had spoken figuratively? It was his constant practice to explain all things that they could understand. Thus he explained the parable of the sower and other parables. But when it was a question of mysteries which they could not understand until after events should have come to pass, he allowed them to keep the words in their hearts and wait. Such is the case here. The doctrine of the Eucharist must be promulgated to the world. In the sixty-third verse, Jesus had explained the high mode of being of the Eucharist as much as could be done then. There was but one thing to be done. Jesus could not take away the mystery; men must accept the mystery. Therefore he insists on this truth, even though it drove men from his following.

It is evident that Peter is always accepted by the Apostles as their representative in dealing with the Lord. In this capacity, he expresses, in the name of all the apostolic body, that they will not leave Jesus.

Certainly Peter could not certify the interior faith of the Apostles. He spoke what he believed and felt, and what he judged the other Apostles believed also.

Jesus' answer is a sad one. Peter spoke as though all twelve were still loyal. But Jesus' omniscience had penetrated the dark soul of Judas, and had discovered there the evil which would afterwards perpetrate the awful crime of selling Jesus unto death. And Jesus declares: "One of you is a devil."

He makes this declaration to show men that he was not deceived in choosing Judas: he chose him, knowing that he was an evil man.

In calling Judas a devil, Jesus meant that he moved in the spirit of the devil.

This declaration moved the other Apostles to have faith in their divine Master, when the treason of Judas fulfilled this prophecy.

Judas is sometimes called Iscariot, and sometimes the son of Simon Iscariot, showing that both father and son bore the surname Iscariot. Concerning the probable sense of the

term Iscariot, we have given our opinion when treating of the calling of the twelve.

Now inasmuch as Jesus does not say that one of the Apostles will be a devil, but that he actually is a devil, we must recognize that at that time Judas was bad. Nay more, Jesus' peculiar expression: "Did I not choose you twelve, and one of you is a devil?" clearly expresses that Jesus chose Judas with full knowledge of his evil soul. Hence we are led to inquire why Jesus should choose such a man for an Apostle.

We are persuaded that the calling of Judas the traitor was ordained by Jesus to prove that the power of the apostolic office is not invalidated by the unworthiness of the individual. Jesus Christ knew that scandals would come, and he predicted them. Men had need to be taught that the presence of these scandals in the Church does not indicate that the gates of hell are prevailing against her. Hence, Jesus showed to the world in the selection of Judas that the divine element of the Church is not essentially dependent on the human element; he showed that there can be failures in the human element, but no failure in the divine element. The individual can fail; the office never fails. Some of those who have held the highest places in the Church have imitated the example of Judas. And yet, as notwithstanding the defection of Judas, the original Apostles accomplished their mission, so in spite of the failure of some of her ministers, the Church of God accomplishes the grand purpose for which she was founded.

MATT. XV. 1—20

1. Τότε προσέρχονται τῷ Ἰησοῦ ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων Φαρισαῖοι καὶ γραμματεῖς λέγοντες:

MARK VII. 1—23

1. Καὶ συνάγονται πρὸς αὐτὸν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι, καὶ τινὲς τῶν γραμματέων, ἐλθόντες ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων,

2. Καὶ ἰδόντες τινὰς τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ ὅτι κοιναῖς χερσίν, τουτέστιν ἀνίπτοις, ἐσθίουσιν τοὺς ἄρτους.

3. Οἱ γὰρ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ πάντες οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, ἐὰν μὴ πυγμῇ νίψωνται τὰς χεῖρας, οὐκ ἐσθίουσιν, κρατοῦντες τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων.

2. Διὰ τί οἱ μαθηταί σου παραβαίνουσιν τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων; οὐ γὰρ νίπτονται τὰς χεῖρας, ὅταν ἄρτον ἐσθίωσιν.

3. Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς, εἶπεν αὐτοῖς: Διατί καὶ ὑμεῖς παραβαίνετε τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ, διὰ τὴν παράδοσιν ὑμῶν;

4. Ὁ γὰρ Θεὸς εἶπεν: Τίμα τὸν πατέρα, καὶ τὴν μητέρα: καὶ ὁ κακολογῶν πατέρα ἢ μητέρα, θανάτῳ τελευτάτῳ.

5. Ὑμεῖς δὲ λέγετε: Ὃς ἂν εἴπῃ τῷ πατρί, ἢ τῇ μητρί: Δῶρον, ὃ ἐάν ἐξ ἐμοῦ ὠφεληθῇς, οὐ μὴ τιμήσει τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ.

6. Καὶ ἠκυρώσατε τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ τὴν παράδοσιν ὑμῶν.

7. Ὑποκριταί, καλῶς ἐπροφήτευσεν περὶ ὑμῶν Ἡσαΐας, λέγων:

8. Ὁ λαὸς οὗτος τοῖς χεῖλεσίν με τιμᾷ, ἡ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πόρρῳ ἀπέχει ἀπ' ἐμοῦ.

9. Μάτην δὲ σέβονται με, διδάσκοντες διδασκαλίας, ἐντάλματα ἀνθρώπων.

4. Καὶ ἀπ' ἀγορᾶς, ἐὰν μὴ ραντίσωνται, οὐκ ἐσθίουσιν, καὶ ἄλλα πολλά ἐστὶν ἃ παρέλαβον κρατεῖν, βαπτισμοὺς ποτηρίων, καὶ ξεστῶν, καὶ χαλκίων.

5. Καὶ ἐπερωτῶσιν αὐτὸν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς: Διὰ τί οὐ περιπατοῦσιν οἱ μαθηταί σου κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, ἀλλὰ κοιναῖς χερσὶν ἐσθίουσιν τὸν ἄρτον;

6. Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς: Καλῶς ἐπροφήτευσεν Ἡσαΐας περὶ ὑμῶν τῶν ὑποκριτῶν, ὡς γέγραπται, ὅτι ὁ λαὸς οὗτος τοῖς χεῖλεσίν με τιμᾷ, ἡ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πόρρῳ ἀπέχει ἀπ' ἐμοῦ.

7. Μάτην δὲ σέβονται με, διδάσκοντες διδασκαλίας, ἐντάλματα ἀνθρώπων.

8. Ἀφέντες τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ, κρατεῖτε τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

9. Καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς: Καλῶς ἀθετεῖτε τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἵνα τὴν παράδοσιν ὑμῶν τηρήσητε.

10. Μωϋσῆς γὰρ εἶπεν: Τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα σου, καὶ ὁ κακολογῶν πατέρα ἢ μητέρα, θανάτῳ τελευτάτω.

11. Ὑμεῖς δὲ λέγετε: Ἐὰν εἴπῃ ἄνθρωπος τῷ πατρὶ ἢ τῇ μητρὶ, Κορβάν (ὃ ἐστὶν δῶρον) ὃ ἐὰν ἐξ ἐμοῦ ὠφελῇθῃς,

12. Οὐκέτι ἀφίετε αὐτὸν οὐδὲν ποιῆσαι τῷ πατρὶ, ἢ τῇ μητρὶ.

13. Ἀκυροῦντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ τῇ παραδόσει ὑμῶν ἢ παρεδώκατε, καὶ παρόμοια τοιαῦτα πολλὰ ποιεῖτε.

10. Καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος τὸν ὄχλον, εἶπεν αὐτοῖς: Ἀκούετε καὶ συνίετε:

11. Οὐ τὸ ἐρχόμενον εἰς τὸ στόμα κοινοῖ τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἐκπορευόμενον ἐκ τοῦ στόματος, τοῦτο κοινοῖ τὸν ἄνθρωπον.

12. Τότε προσελθόντες οἱ μαθηταί, λέγουσιν αὐτῷ: Οἶδας ὅτι οἱ Φαρισαῖοι ἀκούσαντες τὸν λόγον, ἐσκανδαλίσθησαν;

13. Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς, εἶπεν: Πᾶσα φυτεία, ἣν οὐκ ἐφύτευσεν ὁ Πατήρ μου ὁ οὐράνιος, ἐκριζωθήσεται.

14. Ἄφετε αὐτούς: τυφλοί εἰσιν ὁδοῖ. Τυφλὸς δὲ τυφλὸν ἐὰν ὁδηγῇ, ἀμφότεροι εἰς βόθυνον πεσοῦνται.

15. Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Πέτρος αὐτῷ εἶπεν: Φράσον ἡμῖν τὴν παραβολήν.

14. Καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος πάλιν τὸν ὄχλον, ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς: Ἀκούσατέ μου πάντες, καὶ σύνετε.

15. Οὐδὲν ἐστὶν ἔξωθεν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου εἰσπορευόμενον εἰς αὐτόν, ὃ δύναται κοινῶσαι αὐτόν: ἀλλὰ τὰ ἐκ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκπορευόμενα, ἔστιν τὰ κοινοῦντα τὸν ἄνθρωπον.

17. Καὶ ὅτε εἰσῆλθεν εἰς οἶκον ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου, ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταί αὐτοῦ τὴν παραβολήν.

16. Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν: Ἀκμὴν καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀσύνετοί ἐστε;

17. Οὐ νοεῖτε, ὅτι πᾶν τὸ εἰσερχόμενον εἰς τὸ στόμα, εἰς τὴν κοιλίαν χωρεῖ καὶ εἰς ἀφεδρῶνα ἐκβάλλεται;

18. Τὰ δὲ ἐκπορευόμενα ἐκ τοῦ στόματος, ἐκ τῆς καρδίας ἐξέρχεται, κἀκεῖνα κοινοῖ τὸν ἄνθρωπον.

19. Ἐκ γὰρ τῆς καρδίας ἐξέρχονται διαλογισμοὶ πονηροί, φόνοι, μοιχεῖαι, πορνεῖαι, κλοπαί, ψευδομαρτυρίαι, βλασφημίαι.

20. Ταῦτά ἐστιν τὰ κοινοῦντα τὸν ἄνθρωπον, τὸ δὲ ἀνίπτοις χερσὶν φαγεῖν οὐ κοινοῖ τὸν ἄνθρωπον.

1. Then there come to Jesus from Jerusalem Pharisees and scribes, saying:

18. Καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς: Οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀσύνετοί ἐστε; οὐ νοεῖτε ὅτι πᾶν τὸ ἐξωθεν εἰσπορευόμενον εἰς τὸν ἄνθρωπον, οὐ δύναται αὐτὸν κοινῶσαι;

19. Ὅτι οὐκ εἰσπορεύεται αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν καρδίαν, ἀλλ' εἰς τὴν κοιλίαν, καὶ εἰς τὸν ἀφεδρῶνα ἐκπορεύεται, καθαρίζων πάντα τὰ βρώματα.

20. Ἐλεγον δὲ, ὅτι τὸ ἐκ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκπορευόμενον, ἐκεῖνο κοινοῖ τὸν ἄνθρωπον.

21. Ἐσῶθεν γὰρ ἐκ τῆς καρδίας τῶν ἀνθρώπων οἱ διαλογισμοὶ οἱ κακοὶ ἐκπορεύονται,

22. Πορνεῖαι, κλοπαί, φόνοι, μοιχεῖαι, πλεονεξίαι, πονηρίαι, δόλος, ἀσέλγεια, ὀφθαλμὸς πονηρὸς, βλασφημία, ὑπερηφανία, ἀφροσύνη.

23. Πάντα ταῦτα τὰ πονηρὰ ἔσῶθεν ἐκπορεύεται, καὶ κοινοῖ τὸν ἄνθρωπον.

1. And there are gathered together unto him the Pharisees, and certain of the scribes, who had come from Jerusalem.

2. And had seen that some of his disciples ate their bread with defiled, that is, unwashed, hands.

3. For the Pharisees, and all the Jews, except they wash their hands up to the wrist, eat not, holding the tradition of the elders.

4. And when they come from the market-place, except they wash themselves, they eat

2. Why do thy disciples transgress the tradition of the elders? for they wash not their hands when they eat bread.

3. And he answered and said unto them: Why do ye also transgress the commandment of God because of your tradition?

4. For God said; Honor thy father and thy mother: and: He that speaketh evil of father or mother, let him die the death.

5. But ye say: Whosoever shall say to his father or his mother: That wherewith thou mightest have been profited by me is given to God;

6. He shall not honor his father. And ye have made void the word of God because of your tradition.

7. Ye hypocrites, well did Isaiah prophesy of you, saying:

8. This people honoreth me with their lips; but their heart is far from me.

9. But in vain do they worship me, teaching as their doctrines the precepts of men.

not: and many other things there be, which they have received to hold, washings of cups, and pots, and brazen vessels.

5. And the Pharisees and the scribes ask him: Why walk not thy disciples according to the tradition of the elders, but eat their bread with defiled hands?

6. And he said unto them: Well did Isaiah prophesy of you hypocrites, as it is written: This people honoreth me with their lips, but their heart is far from me.

7. But in vain do they worship me, teaching as their doctrines the precepts of men.

8. Ye leave the commandment of God, and hold fast the tradition of men.

9. And he said unto them: Full well do ye reject the commandment of God, that ye may keep your tradition.

10. For Moses said: Honor thy father and thy mother; and: He that speaketh evil of father or mother, let him die the death:

11. But ye say: If a man shall say to his father or his mother: That wherewith thou mightest have been profited by me is Corban, that is to say: Given to God;

12. Ye no longer suffer him to do aught for his father or his mother;

13. Making void the word of God by your tradition, which ye have delivered: and many such like things ye do.

14. And he called to him the multitude again, and said unto them: Hear me all of you, and understand:

15. There is nothing from without the man, that going into him can defile him: but the things which proceed out of the man are those that defile the man.

10. And he called to him the multitude, and said unto them: Hear, and understand;

11. Not that which entereth into the mouth defileth the man; but that which proceedeth out of the mouth, this defileth the man.

12. Then came the disciples, and said unto him: Knowest thou that the Pharisees were scandalized, when they heard this saying?

13. But he answered and said: Every plant which my heavenly Father planted not, shall be rooted up.

14. Let them alone: they are blind guides. And if the blind guide the blind, both shall fall into a pit.

15. And Peter answered and said unto him: Declare unto us the parable.

16. And he said: Are ye also even yet without understanding?

17. Perceive ye not, that whatsoever goeth into the mouth passeth into the belly, and is cast out into the privy?

18. But the things which proceed out of the mouth come forth out of the heart; and they defile the man.

19. For out of the heart come forth evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, theft, false witness, railings:

20. These are the things which defile the man: but to eat with unwashed hands defileth not the man.

17. And when he was entered into the house from the multitude, his disciples asked of him the parable.

18. And he saith unto them: Are ye so without understanding also? Perceive ye not, that whatsoever from without goeth into the man, it cannot defile him;

19. Because it goeth not into his heart, but into his belly, and goeth out into the privy? This he said, making all meats clean.

20. And he said: That which proceedeth out of the man, that defileth the man.

21. For from within, out of the heart of men, evil thoughts proceed,

22. Fornications, thefts, murders, adulteries, covetings, wickedness, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, railing, pride, foolishness:

23. All these evil things proceed from within, and defile the man.

In Verse four of the text of Matthew many codices have *ἐνετείλατο* instead of *εἶπεν*. Tischendorf favors *ἐνετείλατο*. B and D, et al. have *εἶπεν*. In the fifth verse many authorities place *καί* before *οὐ*. *Καί* is omitted in *8*, B, C, and D. In the same verse, many authorities add *ἡ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ*. This reading is adopted by the Vulgate, Syriac, Coptic, Armenian,

and Ethiopian versions. The phrase is omitted by \aleph , B, D, and by Westcott and Hort. In Verse six τὸν νόμον is the reading of \aleph^* , C, and of Tischendorf; many codices have τὴν ἐντολήν. B and D have τὸν λόγον, and this is followed by the Syriac, Coptic, Armenian and Ethiopian versions. In Verse eleven Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort approve εἰσερχόμενον instead of ἐρχόμενον. In Verse fourteen many codices have ὁδηγοί εἰσι τυφλοὶ τυφλῶν. This is endorsed by Tischendorf. The reading of B is supported by \aleph^c , D, L, and Z. In Verse seventeen most of the codices have οὕπω. \aleph , B, D, and Z have οὐ.

In the second verse of Mark's text \aleph , B, L, Δ and 33 have ἐσθίουσιν τοὺς ἄρτους. A, D, N, X, Γ , Π , et al. have ἐσθιόντας. After ἄρτους F, K, M, N, S, U, Π et al. add ἐμέμψαντο. This is followed by the Vulgate, Armenian and Syriac versions. It seems to have been added to avoid an anacoluthon. It is not found in \aleph , A, B, E, G, H, L, V, X, Γ , Δ and many others; neither is it found in the Coptic, Ethiopian, and Gothic versions. In Verse three πυγμῇ is the common reading of the Greek codices. \aleph has πυκνά which seems to be a conjectural reading which arose out of the difficulty of explaining πυγμῇ. The Vulgate is in conformity with \aleph . The Syriac renders the term by "sedulously." In Verse four, \aleph and B have ῥαντίζονται which is approved by Westcott and Hort. Tischendorf endorses the reading βαπτίζονται, which is the reading of most of the codices. At the end of the fourth verse, καὶ κλινῶν is added in A, D, X, Γ , Π , et al. This has the endorsement of Origen, and is followed by the Vulgate, Syriac, Gothic, and Armenian versions. In Verse five κοιναῖς is the reading of \aleph^* , B, and D. This is followed by the Vulgate, Coptic and Armenian versions, and by the protestant Revised Edition. Many of the codices have ἀνίπτους. In the eighth verse A, X, Γ , Π , et al. add βαπτισμοὺς ξεστῶν καὶ ποτηρίων, καὶ ἄλλα παρόμοια τοιαῦτα πολλὰ ποιεῖτε. D has this clause but places it at the beginning of the verse. The clause is adopted by the Vulgate, Gothic, Syriac, Ethiopian and Armenian versions. In the twelfth verse the reading καὶ οὐκέτι is found in A, X, Γ , Π , et al. This is followed by the Vulgate, Gothic, Syriac and Armenian versions. The

καί is omitted by \aleph , B, D, and Δ , and by the Coptic and Armenian versions, and by the Revised Edition of Oxford. After the fifteenth verse the sentence Εἰ τις ἔχει ὦτα ἀκούειν, ἀκουέτω is found in A, D, X, Γ, Π, et al. This reading is adopted by the Vulgate, and is therein numbered the sixteenth verse of the text. It is also followed by the Gothic, Syriac, and Armenian versions and appears as a correction in some codices of the Ethiopian versions. It is omitted by \aleph , B, L, Δ^* , 28, 102, the Coptic version, Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort, and by the Revised Version of Oxford. In Verse nineteen, \aleph , A, B, E, F, G, H, L, S, X, Δ et al. have καθαρίζων. Some minor authorities have καθαρίζον.

The great miracle of the multiplication of the loaves, and the miracles of healing wrought by Jesus in Galilee increased the opposition of the Pharisees and of their inseparable associates the scribes. Members of the sect were scattered about through all the land of the Jews, but Jerusalem was their main center; and at Jerusalem those who were reputed the most learned of their doctors had their habitat. Hence from Jerusalem a number of these wily sectaries set out with the one purpose of entrapping and discrediting Jesus. All his grand doctrines and all his miracles are of no avail with the Pharisees. They impugn the known truth; everything that tends to prove the divine character of Jesus increases their hate of him, and their determination to crush him. The Pharisees are a fearful example of the extent to which human malice can go. Their souls were steeped in falsehood and evil.

With lynx-eyes they watch the Saviour and his little band of followers. If the Pharisees' hearts were open to the truth, how much of good they could have observed in that close scrutiny! But the Pharisees hate truth and goodness, and consequently they hate Jesus. They watch, and discover that some of his disciples have eaten with "common hands." The term κοινόν, *common*, is frequently used in New Testament Greek to designate that which is profane and unholy. Thus it is used in Acts X. 15, and in Rom. XIV. 14. The intention of the Evangelists is not to say that the disciples neglected personal cleanness in their modes of life, but only that they neglected the ritual ablutions.

Mark declares that the Pharisees only observed *some* of the disciples to violate the ordinance of washing before meat. He does not thereby indicate that there was a difference in discipline among the disciples, but only that the Pharisees based their charges on observation of actions in which not all the disciples participated. It is quite probable that in his daily intercourse with the Apostles Jesus had taught his disciples the inanity of these Pharisaic traditions, which were mere excrescences upon a ritual law that was itself now empty and dead, like the cocoon of the larva after life has been evolved therefrom.

In Leviticus XV. 16, a man was commanded to bathe his body after a seminal emission, but there is no precept in the ritual law concerning the washing of hands before eating. Such an observance was purely an outcome of Pharisaic traditionalism, a tradition of the elders. According to the Talmud the ordinance was of strict obligation, but the Talmud is such a tissue of extravagant fables, that its authority can not be relied upon in anything. It is the spirit of the Pharisees that lives in the makers of the Talmud; but in the days of the Talmudists, that spirit seems to have eliminated every vestige of reason and decency from the Jewish doctors. Hence it is profitless to turn to the Talmud to obtain a knowledge of the religious ideas and ordinances prevailing in Christ's time. Much of the Talmud is made up of absurd fables and nugæ that came into being at a much later date. Hence we shall not attempt to examine the question of the washing of the hands from a Talmudic standpoint. Lightfoot, Wünsche, Schöttgen and Wetstein have written some Rabbinic notes on this question, but, as Edersheim declares, they give no clear account. Suffice it for our present purpose that such an ordinance was in universal acceptance among the Jews. A side light is thrown upon this question by the sixth verse of the second chapter of St. John wherein it is stated that six waterpots stood by at the marriage feast, in accordance with the manner of purification of the Jews.

St. Mark, in describing this ordinance of the Jews, uses the expression: *πυγμῇ νίψωνται*. The difficulty of explaining this expression drove some to change *πυγμῇ* to *πυκνά*. The

Vulgate evidently adopted this conjecture, rendering the term "crebro." Even the Revised Version of Oxford renders the phrase to *wash diligently*. Now the evidence of the authorities for *πυγμῆ* is such that its genuineness can not be doubted. Moreover the rendering *wash diligently* has no meaning, and the Vulgate rendering to wash *frequently* is not substantiated by an examination of the facts. There is no evidence that the Pharisaic ordinance directed to wash frequently during a meal. Wherefore we must endeavor to explain the genuine reading *πυγμῆ*.

The term *πυγμῆ* means the fist; the only question for us is to determine what sense to give to it here, as it occurs in the dative case. Knabenbauer believes the sense to be that the Jews in these rites of washing closed the fist of one hand, and with it rubbed the other. This is an awkward mode of action that never would have been adopted without some specific reason. Now in all the description of these rites preserved for us there is no mention of any such mode of washing.

But on the contrary, we find evidence in the Talmud which seems to us sufficient to warrant the rendering *πυγμῆ* of St. Mark by "up to the wrist." Thus Alfred Edersheim describes the ritual ordinance of the washing of the hands:

"But there is another and more important aspect of the expression, which leads us to describe the rite itself. The distinctive designation for it is *Netilath Yadayim*, literally, the lifting of the hands; while for the washing before meat the term *Meshi* or *Mesha* is also used, which literally means 'to rub.' Both these terms point to the manner or the rite. The first question here was, whether 'second tithe,' prepared first-fruits [*Terumah*], or even common food [*Chullin*], or else, 'holy,' i. e. sacrificial food, was to be partaken of. In the latter case a complete immersion of the hands ['baptism,' *Tebhilath Yadayim*], and not merely a *Netilath*, or 'uplifting,' was prescribed. The latter was really an affusion. As the purifications were so frequent, and care had to be taken that the water had not been used for other purposes, or something fallen into it that might discolor or defile it, large vessels or jars were generally kept for the purpose. These might be of any material, although stone is specially mentioned. It was the

practice to draw water out of these with what was called a *natla*, *antila*, or *antelaya*, very often of glass, which must hold [at least] a quarter of a log—a measure equal to one and a half ‘egg-shells.’ For, no less quantity than this might be used for affusion. The water was poured on both hands, which must be free of anything covering them, such as gravel, mortar, etc. The hands were lifted up, so as to make the water run to the wrist, in order to ensure that the whole hand was washed, and that the water polluted by the hand did not again run down the fingers. Similarly, each hand was rubbed with the other, provided the hand that was rubbed had been affused: otherwise, the rubbing might be done against the head, or even against a wall. But there was one point on which special stress was laid. In the ‘first affusion,’ which was all that originally was required when the hands were Levitically ‘defiled,’ the water had to run down the wrist [לַפֶּרֶק, or עַד הַפֶּרֶק]. If the water remained short of the wrist, the hands were not clean. Accordingly, the words of St. Mark can only mean that the Pharisees eat not ‘except they wash their hands to the wrist.’”—Edersheim, “The Life and Times of Jesus,” Vol. II, pp. 10—11.

We must state here that we agree with Edersheim against Lightfoot in the translation of the phrase עַד הַפֶּרֶק of the Mishna, Yadaim II. 3. Lightfoot renders the whole passage: “The hands are defiled, and washed up to the articulation of the elbow.”—Lightfoot, “Horæ Hebraicæ,” In Evang. S. Marci, Caput VII.

Now what the Mishna really does say is that the hands are defiled and washed up to the articulation, and Lightfoot has simply conjectured that it meant the articulation of the elbow. such an able scholar as Wetstein has proven that this is an erroneous rendering of the Talmudic term. The language of the Mishna, and all that we can find concerning the usages of the Jews in this rite of washing move us to believe that the articulation signified in the Mishnic treatise Yadaim is the articulation of the wrist. Thus the two texts mutually help each other, and establish the fact that in these ritual washings, the Jews washed the hands up to the wrist.

Another Pharisaic ordinance was that a Jew who had been in the market-place, on returning home must purify himself with water. This rite was based on the presumption that he might have come in contact with some unclean person or thing. This washing was not a bath of the whole person, but most probably a handwashing. Their culinary utensils and the articles of the table-service were also washed in accordance with a ritual observance. If we accept the reading *καὶ κλινῶν* of St. Mark, which has good endorsement, we must extend the rite of washing to the couches on which the guests reclined while eating.

It is remarkable what importance the Jews gave to these traditions of the Elders. In the Talmudic Tractate Berachoth, fol. 3, 2, it is declared that "the words of the Elders are of more weight than the words of the Prophets"; and in the Tractate Sota, fol. 4^b, "that he who eats with unwashed hands is to be considered as though he had committed fornication."

This stupid concentration of mind upon these mere external details eliminated all trace of supernaturalism from Pharisaic teaching. How disgusting it must have been to the Son of God to see this degeneracy in the chosen people of his Father? In the response of the Lord to the Pharisees there is discernible a remarkable prudence. He does not directly condemn the inane traditions of the Pharisees; such rites were too stupid to merit even a formal condemnation. Besides, a direct condemnation of these observances that the people were attached to would arouse needless opposition from the Jews. Wherefore Jesus takes a broader view of the issue, and directly arraigns the teachers of Israel for having set aside the commandments of God in favor of their own opinions.

We prefer the order of Matthew in this part of Jesus' discourse. In the relation of Mark the prophecy of Isaiah is quoted against the Pharisees at the very beginning of Jesus' discourse. In Matthew the prophecy is quoted at the end of the discourse, as a corroboration of Jesus' rebuke of them. This latter seems the more natural and forcible way.

In Exodus XX. 12 it was commanded: "Honor thy father and thy mother; that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee." And in Exodus,

XXI. 17: "And he that revileth his father or his mother, he shall surely be put to death."

In Deuteronomy XXVII. 16, God curses the man who dishonors his parents: "Cursed be he that maketh light of his father or of his mother. And all the people shall say, Amen." The words of Proverbs XXX. 17, are terrible:

"The eye that mocketh at his father
And despiseth to obey his mother,
The ravens of the valley shall pick it out,
And the young eagles shall eat it."

The debt that we owe our parents is so great that we can never repay it. One of the most beautiful things in all the created universe is the instinctive love of parents for their children. That love is tender, patient, self-denying, unfailing. When has the worthy parent swerved from death to save the child? The love of passion cools; men grow tired of former friends; but the parent's love endures through the changes of time, and through the vicissitudes of fortune. When the Gibeonites hanged Armoni and Mephibosheth the sons of Saul in Gibeah, Rizpah their mother took sackcloth and spread it for her upon the rock, from the beginning of harvest until rain came upon them from heaven; and she suffered neither the birds of the air to rest upon them by day, nor the beasts of the field by night."—II. Sam. XXI. 10. This desolate woman, alone there in the desert place watching the decaying bodies of her slaughtered sons for that long interval, is a notable example of the strength of a mother's love. In the helpless years of infancy the patient mother's care is given without stint in sickness and in health. The father's labor is gladly given that his beloved child may be provided for. While the child sleeps, hands scarred and wearied by toil are busy with labor to provide shelter, and food, and raiment, and education for that child. Almost one third of a lifetime is passed by the child before he is fully able to assume the full responsibility of his life. Most base and unnatural therefore is the crime of the child who in return for all that the parents have done for him refuses them love and honor, and help in their need.

Wherefore God explicitly commanded a man to give a fitting respect to his parents, to refrain from any abusive word

or disrespectful act towards them, and to provide for their maintenance in case of their indigence. This was the command of God, sublime and just, the command in which revelation and the dictates of the natural law are in perfect accord. How grand it stands out in its contrast with the miserable petty traditions of the Pharisees concerning the washing of hands?

But Pharisaic casuistry had found a way to set aside this commandment of God in favor of their own greed. The offerings that came to the temple were made the Pharisees' prey; hence it was to their interest to have these as rich as possible. The generic Hebrew name of any offering in the temple was קָרְבָּן, *korban*. Mark uses the original term, and explains it as meaning a gift, but his explanation must be taken in conjunction with the theme of which he is treating: it was a gift offered in the temple. Now Christ contemplates a case where a man has parents who are unprovided with the means of living. According to Pharisaic teaching such a man could by vow consecrate to the temple whatever he would otherwise have given to his parents. The formula of the vow is given by both Matthew and Mark; and they state the consequences that followed. When once such a vow was made, the Rabbis held the author of it strictly to its letter, and declared it to be sacrilege to give anything to the father or to the mother. It seems that the teachers in Israel invited the people to these unlawful vows. The man thus vowing was exempt, yea even prohibited from giving anything to his parents, even in their extreme need; and he was obliged to increase his offerings in the temple proportionately to the amount that he would have given his indigent parents.

The baseness and dishonesty of the Pharisees is a thing without a name: it beggars description.

The clause in the fifth verse of Matthew: "— he shall not honor his father," is equivalent to the expression, "he shall not be held, by your teaching, to honor his father by providing for his maintenance."

These teachings were a mere trafficking in a people's religion, a system of ordinances by which the eternal commandments of God and the dictates of the best in nature were set aside in order that these venal hirelings might have much of

the fat of the land. The tradition concerning the vows was not by any means the only thing in which Pharisaic teaching conflicted with Yahveh's Law: this case was only taken as an example. Hence Jesus says; "— and many such like things ye do." Justly did Jesus call them hypocrites. Jesus never seems to have contemplated the conversion of this class of men. He is merciful to all sinners; but to the Pharisees he is severe; for they committed that awful sin against the Holy Ghost, and their case was hopeless.

The prophecy of Isaiah here quoted is found in Isaiah XXIX. 13. It stands thus in the original: "And the Lord said: Forasmuch as this people draw nigh unto me with their mouth, and with their lips do honor me, but have removed their heart far from me, and their fear of me is a commandment of men which hath been taught, etc."

The Septuagint is in substance thus: "And the Lord saith: This people draw nigh unto me with their mouth; and with their lips do honor me; but their heart is far from me. But in vain do they honor me teaching the precepts and the doctrines of men."

Now it is evident that the quotation, as it exists in Matthew and Mark, is according to the Septuagint. This shows the great authority which the writers of the New Testament gave to the Septuagint.

Moreover, it is clear that there is no substantial discrepancy between the original and the Septuagint. The Septuagint simply brings out the full sense of the original. The crime of Israel in the days of Christ was but an aggravation of the conditions that existed in the time of Isaiah; hence this prophecy spoken by Isaiah of the men of his time fitly described the condition of religious thought in Israel in the time of Christ, and is quoted with telling force against the teachers of Israel.

Religion always was and always will be a work of the spirit of man. Everything that is external in religion is only a help to the spirit. Moved by the peculiar condition of the chosen people, and by their peculiar environment, God gave a complex ritual in the first manner of worship. But all these external rites were intended as symbols and types to help the spirit to realize the existence and the attributes of Yahveh.

But when these rites exist without the spiritual element in religion, they are like a thing made into the semblance of a man, in which there is no soul and life. Isaiah's contemporaries and Christ's contemporaries were much in systematizing Rabbinic decisions on the mere externals of the law, but the soul of the people was dead. That which should have been the living worship of a spiritual God, that which bore the august name of religion, had become a dreary mass of stupid casuistry. Christ awoke the world to new religious life; but man is ever prone to fall into formalism in religion. Many a man has lived and died nominally in the Christian religion, without ever grasping much of its spiritual nature. It is true, our formalism is not of that gross and stupid nature, as was that of the Pharisees; but still it has no life, and is a disappointment to God. It is not an easy thing to be a spiritual man; it is the noblest thing of which our nature is capable, a thing that makes a man akin to the angels.

Up to this point the discourse of Jesus had been directed to the Pharisees. He now calls to himself the people, and adopting an entirely different tenor of discourse, he teaches them the truth of the issue. Jesus always had compassion on the common people; his words to these are never severe.

Jesus begins his discourse to the people by an exhortation which makes known the importance of the doctrine about to be delivered.

The Lord lays down a clear comprehensive principle: Not the things that a man takes into his mouth from without defile the man, but the things that come from his heart defile him.

For the sake of the antithesis the Lord has contrasted the thing that goes into the mouth with the thing that comes from the heart out of the mouth. Of course, Jesus' discourse must be taken in the light of the context. It is not necessary that the evil should be externally manifested, in order that defilement of the man be wrought: it is enough that the evil harbors in the heart. But this evil is spoken of by Jesus in its phase as it is outwardly manifested, in order to preserve the naturalness of the contrast.

This declaration of Jesus seemed to conflict with the Law of Moses. The Mosaic Law clearly prohibited the eating of

certain articles of food, such as the flesh of swine, the blood of animals, etc. Daniel and his companions preserved this abstinence from forbidden meats, and God wrought a miracle in their behalf; thus also Judith in the camp of Holofernes would not eat the forbidden meats. The aged Eleazar in the days of the Maccabees died rather than eat the flesh of swine. The words of Christ swept away all the distinctions in meats; and the Pharisees give evidence that they are scandalized by such doctrine.

The Lord and his Apostles now withdraw from the assembly, and go into a house, and then the Apostles come to Jesus and through their usual spokesman Peter, they tell Jesus of the effect of his words upon the Pharisees, and they ask him to explain the issue to them. It is evident from the Apostles' action that they also were perplexed by the words of Jesus.

In his response Jesus is very severe against the Pharisees. Contemplating them and their doctrines under the figure of a planting, he declares that they are not his Father's planting, and that they shall be rooted up. The Pharisees claimed to be the interpreters of God's word to the people, but Jesus says that they are spurious. And more than this, Jesus will not have aught to do with them, except to confute them and liberate the people from them. He uses the popular aphorism concerning them, that they were blind guides who must necessarily lead into a pit. The figure is plain and forcible. It warned the people against doing as the Pharisees did. The figure was not to be insisted on too literally. In the days when the people had no other leaders, they were obliged to depend on the Pharisees for an explanation of the Law. And the poor people did no wrong in accepting the Pharisees' explanation of Moses' Law. But when the light came with Christ, the evidence was sufficient, that the people should have left the following of their wicked guides, and should have gone after Christ. This was the Israelitic people's crime. This it was wherein the people partook of the wicked blindness of their guides.

The Pharisaic sect was a thing that God never authorized. It was a noxious weed that had grown up in the field of God. And in the clearing of the field their fate was to be that of any weed, to be rooted up and destroyed.

There is a fearful emphasis in the words of Jesus: "Let them alone." It signified that he withdrew his spirit from these wicked men, and allowed them to remain in their blindness.

But to the Apostles Jesus vouchsafes an explanation of his words. As is his custom Jesus first gently chides the Apostles for their slowness of understanding. His explanation of his doctrine is so clear that it demands but little comment.

It is hardly necessary to notice the objection that charges Jesus with ignorance of the physical laws of the action of food upon our bodies in saying that whatever goes into the mouth passes out into the privy. It is true that the alimentary principle of food is not thus evacuated by the system, but Jesus used the fact as a moral illustration, and as such the comparison is absolutely perfect. He simply asserts that the human system has the power of separating and casting off the waste matter of all foods, so that they in themselves considered can not defile the moral nature of man. Jesus groups the sins which men commit under several heads, and declares that these as proceeding from the heart defile a man, and not the food that a man eats or the manner of eating it.

In the classification of these evils, by "evil thoughts" Jesus means in a comprehensive sense, all evil as it first exists in the thought of man. By the "evil eye" Jesus means covetousness.

Now we must harmonize the present teaching of Jesus with the Law of Moses which promulgated the unlawfulness of certain meats. In the first place, the Law of Moses was not an eternal ordinance founded on the nature of things. It was a weak, imperfect thing adapted to the peculiar character of the Jewish people. And even in that ordinance, the defilement did not come from the eating of the food *in se*. It came from the breaking of the commandment of God. In that first law the eating of certain meats was not prohibited because it was evil, but it was evil because it was prohibited. The error of Pharisaic teaching was to look upon the things forbidden by these merely preparatory ordinances as things essentially evil. And the first step in changing these ordinances, and in raising religion to a high spiritual plane, was to destroy the error of

Pharisaic teaching which made these things, and also other things invented by their traditions, essentially evil. This the Saviour has done in a plain illustration that can be understood by every man. In Pharisaic teaching there was a blind absolutism that bound the people with bonds of iron. The breaking of the merest tradition of the elders was treated as a thing essentially evil.

Jesus teaches that morality is something higher than this. It is a condition of the man's heart, not of his hands, or of the kind of food which he eats. Of course, in the days when the Mosaic Law was in force, to eat forbidden meat would defile an Israelite; not on account of the nature of the meat, but because the man would disobey God's law, and disobedience of God even in this temporary statute would be a grave sin. So now, the Church acting in the spirit of God, forbids to eat flesh meat on certain days; and the eating of flesh on these days would defile a Catholic, not through the nature of the meat, but because the command of God the Church is against the eating.

When the people had once been taught that the eating of the meats was not essentially evil, the next step would be easy; therefore Jesus as the authorized legate of God could change these. Hence by this logical development the New Law was to be evolved out of the Old.

In the nineteenth verse of Mark much difference of opinion exists concerning the sense of the participle *καθαρίζων*. The Vulgate refers it to *ἀφεδρώνα* in the sense that the *ἀφεδρών* carried away all the useless elements of the food, leaving only the life-giving elements. This opinion is followed by many, among whom is Knabenbauer. To have this construction, they must appeal to an exceptional use of the Greek tongue, by which a participle agreeing with a noun in the accusative case is placed in the nominative. In this sense the privy makes clean all meats, for the reason that it carries away all the worthless elements, leaving in the man only the elements which serve to make living tissue, blood, and vital force.

There is another opinion which has Chrysostom as its chief advocate among the Fathers, and which has received the endorsement of many modern writers and of the protestant

Revised Version. This opinion refers *καθαρίζων* to Jesus, the implied subject of *λέγει* in the eighteenth verse. An objection is urged against this opinion, that the participle is too far removed from its subject. But yet we believe that this irregularity is less than that which must be admitted if the other opinion is accepted. Hence though both opinions are probable, we are moved to accept the latter. Mark wrote at a time when Peter had received his vision at Joppa, Acts X. 15; and he traces the abrogation of the ritual law back to the present words of Jesus.

MATT XV. 21—28

21. Καὶ ἐξελθὼν ἐκεῖθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνεχώρησεν εἰς τὰ μέρη Τύρου καὶ Σιδῶνος.

22. Καὶ ἰδοὺ γυνὴ Χαναναία ἀπὸ τῶν ὀρίων ἐκείνων ἐξεληθοῦσα, ἔκραξεν λέγουσα: Ἐλέησόν με, Κύριε, Υἱὸς Δαυὶδ, ἡ θυγάτηρ μου κακῶς δαιμονίζεται.

23. Ὁ δὲ οὐκ ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῇ λόγον, καὶ προσελθόντες οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, ἠρώτουν αὐτὸν, λέγοντες: Ἀπόλυσον αὐτήν, ὅτι κράζει ὀπισθεν ἡμῶν.

24. Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν: Οὐκ ἀπεστάλην εἰ μὴ εἰς τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἀπολωλότα τοῦ οἴκου Ἰσραὴλ.

25. Ἡ δὲ ἐληθοῦσα προσεκύνει αὐτῷ, λέγουσα: Κύριε, βοήθει μοι.

25. Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν: Οὐκ ἔστιν καλὸν λαβεῖν τὸν ἄρτον τῶν τέκνων, καὶ βαλεῖν τοῖς κυναρίοις.

MARK VII. 24—30

24. Ἐκεῖθεν δὲ ἀναστὰς, ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὰ ὄρια Τύρου καὶ Σιδῶνος, καὶ εἰσελθὼν εἰς οἰκίαν, οὐδὲνα ᾔθελεν γινῶναι, καὶ οὐκ ἠδυνάσθη λαβεῖν.

25. Ἀλλ' εὐθὺς ἀκούσασα γυνὴ περὶ αὐτοῦ, ἧς εἶχε τὸ θυγάτριον αὐτῆς πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον, ἐλθοῦσα προσέπεσεν πρὸς τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ.

26. (Ἡ δὲ γυνὴ ἦν Ἑλληνίς, Συραφοινίκισσα τῷ γένει) καὶ ἠρώτα αὐτὸν ἵνα τὸ δαιμόνιον ἐκβάλῃ ἐκ τῆς θυγατρὸς αὐτῆς.

27. Καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτῇ: Ἄφες πρῶτον χορτασθῆναι τὰ τέκνα: οὐ γάρ ἐστιν καλὸν λαβεῖν τὸν ἄρτον τῶν τέκνων καὶ τοῖς κυναρίοις βαλεῖν.

27. Ἡ δὲ εἶπεν: Ναὶ Κύριε, καὶ τὰ κυνάρια ἐσθίει ἀπὸ τῶν ψυχίων τῶν πιπτόντων ἀπὸ τῆς τραπέζης τῶν κυρίων αὐτῶν.

28. Τότε ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, εἶπεν αὐτῇ: Ὡ γύναι, μεγάλη σου ἡ πίστις, γενηθήτω σοι ὡς θέλεις, καὶ ἰάθη ἡ θυγάτηρ αὐτῆς ἀπὸ τῆς ὥρας ἐκείνης.

21. And Jesus went out thence, and withdrew into the parts of Tyre and Sidon.

22. And behold, a Canaanitish woman came out from those borders, and cried, saying: Have mercy on me, O Lord, thou Son of David; my daughter is grievously vexed with a devil.

23. But he answered her not a word. And his disciples came and besought him, saying: Send her away; for she crieth after us.

24. But he answered and said: I was not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel.

25. But she came and worshipped him, saying: Lord, help me.

28. Ἡ δὲ ἀπεκρίθη, καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ: Ναὶ Κύριε, καὶ τὰ κυνάρια ὑποκάτω τῆς τραπέζης ἐσθίουσιν ἀπὸ τῶν ψυχίων τῶν παιδίων.

29. Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῇ: Διὰ τοῦτον τὸν λόγον ὕπαγε: ἐξελήλυθεν ἐκ τῆς θυγατρὸς σου τὸ δαιμόνιον.

30. Καὶ ἀπελθοῦσα εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτῆς, εὔρε τὸ παιδίον βεβλημένον ἐπὶ τὴν κλίνην, καὶ τὸ δαιμόνιον ἐξεληλυθός.

24. And from thence he arose, and went away into the borders of Tyre and Sidon. And he entered into a house, and would have no man know it: and he could not be hid.

25. But straightway a woman, whose little daughter had an unclean spirit, having heard of him, came and fell down at his feet.

26. Now the woman was a Greek, a Syrophœnician by race. And she besought him that he would cast forth the devil out of her daughter.

26. And he answered and said: It is not meet to take the children's bread and cast it to the dogs.

27. But she said: Yea, Lord: for even the dogs eat of the crumbs which fall from their masters' table.

28. Then Jesus answered and said unto her: O woman, great is thy faith: be it done unto thee even as thou wilt. And her daughter was healed from that hour.

27. And he said unto her: Let the children first be filled: for it is not meet to take the children's bread and cast it to the dogs.

28. But she answered and saith unto him: Yea, Lord: even the dogs under the table eat of the children's crumbs.

29. And he said unto her: For this saying go thy way; the devil is gone out of thy daughter.

30. And she went away unto her house, and found the child laid upon the bed, and the devil gone out.

In the twenty-second verse of Matthew, we find the reading *ἐκραύγασεν αὐτῇ* in C, E, G, K, L, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Π, et al. B and the other authorities have *ἐκραξεν*, omitting *αὐτῇ*. In the same verse B, D and St. Basil are the only authorities that have the form *υἱός*: the others have *υιέ*. In the twenty-seventh verse B and the Peshitto omit *γάρ*.

In the twenty-fourth verse of Mark, Tischendorf omits *καὶ Σιδῶνος*: Westcott and Hort consider it doubtful. It is found in **8**, A, B, N, X, Γ, Π et al., and in the Vulgate, Coptic, Armenian, Ethiopian and Gothic versions, and in all the Syriac versions except the Evangelistary of Jerusalem. In Verse twenty-five *εὐθύς* is found in **8**, B, L, Δ, and 33; it is omitted by A, N, X, Γ, Π, et al. In the twenty-eighth verse *γάρ* is inserted after *καὶ* in the woman's response in A, L, N, X, Γ, Π, et al., and in the Vulgate, Gothic and Syrohexaplar versions.

At this epoch in Jesus' life the Jews in Judæa sought to kill him; and he therefore avoided Judæa, and kept to the northern region. He and his Apostles had gone across the Sea of Galilee seeking a little rest, and the people followed them. He returns, and after the great discourse on the bread of life in

the synagogue of Capharnaum, and his subsequent rebuke of the Pharisees concerning the washing of hands, he and his little band set out towards the cities of Tyre and Sidon on the Mediterranean coast.

It seems quite probable that the motive of the Lord was to seek that rest for his disciples that was denied him across the Sea of Gennesaret, although the journey may have been undertaken for the specific purpose of the event of which we are treating. The Lord's view being infinitely larger than ours, it is impossible at times to see the motives that move him. Things that in his words and actions seem almost contradictory to our feeble and limited view, harmonize in divine and perfect accord in his infinite knowledge of all things.

The founder of the Canaanitish race was Canaan the son of Ham. The first-born of Canaan was Sidon who built the city of Sidon on the coast. This with its sister city Tyre arose to great splendor and opulence, and they were the great centers of the Phœnicians. But when the Romans subjugated the East, all these provinces were called by the general name of Syria, and the different races were distinguished by adding their tribal name to the general name of Syrians. And this was especially necessary in the case of the Syrophœnicians, to distinguish them from Phœnicians dwelling in other parts of the Roman world. Hence we can understand why this woman is called by Matthew a Canaanitish woman. She is called by Mark also a Greek, 'Ελληνίς, in the sense that in the New Testament all Gentiles are frequently designated by that term.

When in the twenty-second verse of Matthew it is asserted that the woman *came out* from the borders of Tyre and Sidon, it is not thereby implied that the woman came thence, and met the Lord in the land of the Jews. It is only stated that after Jesus had entered the land of Tyre and Sidon, this woman came out of her house and came to him.

There is considerable difference between the relation of the event in Matthew and the relation of Mark. According to Matthew the woman comes to the Lord in the way, and follows him, crying out for mercy. Mark speaks only of an interview between the Lord and the woman in a house into which the Lord had gone, seeking to be unknown. A comparative study

of the two accounts leads us to the following view: The woman came to the Lord while he was on the way to some house, wherein he was to harbor for a time. Addressing Jesus as the Son of David, she appeals to him that he have mercy on her demonized daughter. Living in close proximity to the Jews, the woman was aware that the Messiah was to be David's Son; and what she had heard of Jesus convinced her that Jesus was that Messiah.

It is not given us to understand just how comprehensive was the woman's act of faith. She recognized Jesus as the Son of David, as the Messiah, as the great Prophet who healed the sick; but how much she received of the divine character of Jesus we know not. What moved her most was that he whom she believed to be the Messiah worked miracles, and she was in need of a miracle. The recognition of Jesus as the Messiah, even without a clear idea of what the Messiah was, led to perfect faith. It was all that Jesus demanded then. This sure foundation would develop into the fullness of faith as the revelation became clearer by the deeds and teaching of Christ and by the action of the Holy Ghost through the Church. This woman had not the advantages of Israel; no prophets had arisen from her people to make known the message of God; the Law and the Aaronic priesthood were not conceded to her people, and yet she believed, while Israel was unbelieving. Her faith is a rebuke to Israel, while it is an everlasting memorial to all nations of a faithfulness to God rarely equalled. The granting of these petitions was not aimed solely to benefit the petitioners; the miracles were wrought to move the whole world to believe that Jesus is the Son of God. The Syrophenician woman is now dead, and her daughter is dead; but the faith that such events awakened in the whole world is not dead, and can not die.

Though the cries of the woman are loud and piteous, the Lord continues his journey giving no heed to her. The woman follows after the Lord and his disciples, and continues her piteous cries. We also believe that she appeals to the Apostles to intercede for her with the Master. And the Apostles deeply moved come to Jesus and ask him to hear the woman, and send her away. And the Lord answers: "I was not sent

but to the lost sheep of the House of Israel." It is evident from the tenor of the Lord's answer that the Apostles had besought him to grant the woman's request.

The answer of Jesus seemed decisive, and the Apostles are silent. It may be that the woman withdraws for a little time. Jesus and his band go into a house, as privately as possible; for the Master wishes to avoid the people. But he cannot escape from the woman. When the Lord and his Apostles are within, she comes again, and falling at Jesus' feet she again beseeches him to cast forth the devil out of her little daughter. And again she is repulsed in words that seem, at first sight, hard and bitter.

Jesus appeals to a home scene. The children of the householder are sitting at table, and little house-dogs [*τὰ κυνάρια*] are about under the table waiting to be fed. The order in such case would be that the children would be first fed, and then the dogs would receive their portion from that which remained. No right-minded parent would reverse the order, and take the food from the children and give it to the dogs.

In the illustration the Jews are the children of the householder; the Gentiles are the dogs. Now as the Syrophœnician woman was a Gentile, her request was apparently refused, on the ground that she could not expect the blessings reserved for the House of Israel, but must take the portion of dogs. It was a fearful test, but the woman's faith and humility stood the test; and appealing to the same figure which Jesus had used, she reminds him that it was often observed that the little dogs waiting about the table eat of the crumbs that fall from the table. She did not ask to be made equal to the children of Israel; she begged only a crumb that might fall from their table. A place at table, and the full bounty of the banquet might be given to the chosen people; she begged only a crumb. The great virtues of faith and humility are conspicuous in the response of the woman. In fact, great faith seems to demand the accompaniment of humility; for pride is rebellion against God, and how can a man believe intensely in God, when he is in rebellion against God?

There is in the woman's answer also the expression of a high appreciation of Jesus' power. She says in effect that, if Jesus will but grant her a crumb, that it will affect what she desires. And now the faith and holy persistence of the woman are rewarded. Jesus commends her faith, and bids her go her way, that the devil was gone out of her daughter. And the woman going home found her little girl lying in peaceful repose, and the devil was gone out of her.

There are many lessons of high importance in this event. In the first place there is in it a testimony against Israel. The Lord had instructed his Apostles on their first mission not to go in the way of the Gentiles, but to devote all their attention to the cities of Israel. Now his present conduct is not at variance with that former instruction. Though he went into the land of the Phœnicians, he did not go there to preach. On the contrary, he wished no one to know of his presence there. And when the disciples came to Jesus interceding for the woman, he tells them that he was only sent to the children of Israel. By this declaration Jesus affirms that his coming to Israel was an act of justice, in conformity with the treaty made to the patriarchs. Salvation came to the Jews in consequence of that promise; but to the Gentiles, salvation came as a pure act of mercy, independent of any treaty or promise. Hence Jesus was *sent* to fulfill the treaty; his acceptance of the Gentiles was not to stand in the way of the great fulfilment of the promises made to the fathers of Israel.

Jesus' treatment of the woman strikingly evinces that whatever mercy should be done to the Gentiles should not take anything from Israel. Of course, Redemption was to be for the whole world, but for Israel it was to be an act of God's faithfulness in fulfilling his promises; for the Gentiles it was to be a pure act of mercy. And the order was to be to Israel first, and then to the Gentiles. The faith and persistence of the woman moved Jesus to grant her request, but even in granting it, he declares that the prerogatives of Israel must be preserved.

Behold the contrast: Israel was accorded a pre-eminence over all the tribes of the earth in the kingdom of Christ. They were first in everything; they had the place of honor at the table of the Lord, and they despised and rejected the best gifts

of God. And this pagan came and begged with faith and holy persistence for a mere crumb. It is a striking example of those causes that brought about the entrance of the Gentiles into the place of honor once held exclusively by the Jews.

It is profitable to compare Jesus' treatment of this woman with his treatment of other Gentiles in similar circumstances. The Centurion who sent to Jesus to ask of him the cure of his servant was a Gentile, and yet Jesus raises not the issue that the Centurion is outside of the House of Israel. Knabenbauer says in answer to this that the Centurion was a friend of the Jews, that he had benefitted their nation, that the Jews themselves interceded for him, and that he was probably a proselyte to Judaism. We can not find any warrant for the Centurion's proselytism; and the other causes, though true, do not seem to go to the bottom of the event. Jesus was not obliged to treat every one in the same way: he chose to illustrate one virtue by his conduct to one person, and to illustrate another virtue by his conduct towards another. He knew the hearts of all men; he knew that this woman would persevere; and he uses her as an example of the greater faith of the Gentiles, and as a proof that the Gentiles eagerly caught at the least portion of those rich gifts which Israel rejected.

There is also in this event a lesson of faith for all of us. It is the Lord's way to test our faith and the perseverance of our prayers. He has given us many examples of this: Abraham waited for the fulfilment of God's promise to give him a son even till the event became naturally impossible. Abraham was expected to believe that God would give him the land of Canaan, even when he was a sojourner in Egypt and in Gerar. He believed that God would give him a posterity that none could number, even when at God's command his hand was raised to slay his only son.

Jacob believed that the land of Canaan would be given to his seed, and he therefore commanded that his bones be brought up out of Egypt.

Ishmael had sunk exhausted to the ground, and Hagar his mother had withdrawn a little that she might not see him die, when the angel of the Lord appeared, and gave them water.

On the top of Carmel, Eliah prayed for rain when the famine was heavy in Israel and having prayed, he sent his servant to see if any cloud came up from the sea. And the servant returned and said: "There is nothing." Seven times did the great prophet pray and send his servant to look toward the sea, and at the seventh time he saw the little cloud which brought rain arise out of the sea.

The Hebrews were despised by the Philistines, and forced to hide themselves in the caves before the Lord raised up a man to deliver them.

The city of Bethulia was in sore distress through the drought before God raised up Judith to deliver it.

The patriarch Joseph suffered the terror of death, and the bitter burden of slavery before God made him the ruler of Pharaoh's house.

When the Mother of God informed her divine Son that the wine had failed at Cana, his answer tested her faith. The Apostles of Jesus were in imminent danger of shipwreck on the Sea of Gennesaret, before Jesus calmed the storm. When Martha and Mary send to Jesus to save their sick brother, he allows him to die, in order to give a greater manifestation of his Divinity. The two disciples were going back to Emmaus disappointed because it was toward evening of the third day and they had not yet seen the risen Lord.

In like manner Jesus tested the Syrophenician woman's faith. He at first seems to ignore her petition; she persists. He seems to wish to get away from her; she follows. He addresses what might seem a bitter repulse to her; she humbles herself, and asks but a crumb that falls from the table of the children. Here we find faith, perseverance, humility, and they obtained their petition. In many ways Jesus has taught us the value of these qualities of prayer, but many fail in this regard, and complain, and lose faith if Jesus refuses to grant their unwise petitions. In the Holy Ghost David declares: "I have been young and now I am old; yet I have not seen the righteous forsaken, nor his seed begging bread."—Ps. XXXVII. [Vulg. XXXVI.] 25. If God gives not the bread that perisheth, it is only that he may give more abundantly the bread which abideth unto eternal life.

We stand in need of many things; in fact, we rarely realize how necessitous we are. The Lord invites us to ask of him the things we need. The example of the Syrophœnician woman teaches us with what dispositions of soul petitions should be made. We often have no intensity in our petitions for spiritual things, because we prize not the things for which we ask. And even if we ask for temporal blessings, we are often apt to turn back, if ever the Lord delays to hear us. It is certain that if the matter sought be good, and our faith be strong, that we shall move the Lord to grant us what we ask; but the Lord has a right to test our faith, as he did the faith of this woman. The forgiveness of our sins, or the concession of a spiritual grace is a gift of far greater worth than that which this woman petitioned to obtain; and yet have we ever come to the Lord with her earnestness and perseverance to ask for these things of great worth? Our days at most are few in number, and every day, as it hurries to its close, testifies that we are not making of our lives what might be made of them. Many of these days are now past and gone forever; we have but a few left, and yet we continue to spend these in a dull, cold, unspiritual way, and then when the end is come, startled and filled with regret, we utter humanity's great cry: "O, that I could live my life over!" We can not live it over, and we can not change the past; we have only at our disposition that portion of the way which lies between the place in which our feet stand and our grave. If we could bring into our spiritual lives some of the faith and humble perseverance of the Syrophœnician woman, our lives would be far more fruitful in eternal results.

MATT. XV. 29—31

29. Καὶ μεταβάς ἐκείθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ἦλθεν παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν τῆς Γαλιλαίας, καὶ ἀναβάς εἰς τὸ ὄρος, ἐκάθητο ἐκεῖ.

30. Καὶ προσῆλθον αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοί, ἔχοντες μεθ' ἐαυτῶν χωλοὺς, κυλλοὺς, τυφλοὺς, κωφοὺς, καὶ ἐτέρους πολλοὺς, καὶ ἔρριψαν

MARK VII. 31—37

31. Καὶ πάλιν ἐξελθὼν ἐκ τῶν ὀρίων Τύρου ἦλθεν διὰ Σιδῶνος εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν τῆς Γαλιλαίας, ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν ὀρίων Δεκαπόλεως.

32. Καὶ φέρουσιν αὐτῷ κωφὸν καὶ μογιλάλον, καὶ παρακαλοῦσιν αὐτὸν ἵνα ἐπιθῇ αὐτῷ τὴν χεῖρα.

αὐτοὺς παρὰ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ,
καὶ ἐθεράπευσεν αὐτούς.

31. Ὡστε τοὺς ὄχλους βλέποντας, θαυμάσαι κωφοὺς ἀκούοντας, κυλλοὺς ὕγιεις, καὶ χωλοὺς περιπατοῦντας, καὶ ἐδόξασαν τὸν Θεὸν Ἰσραήλ.

29. And Jesus departed thence, and came nigh unto the sea of Galilee: and he went up into the mountain, and sat there.

30. And there came unto him great multitudes, having with them the lame, blind, dumb, maimed, and many others, and they cast them down at his feet; and he healed them:

31. Insomuch that the multitude wondered, when they saw the dumb speaking, the maimed whole, and the lame walking, and the blind seeing: and they glorified the God of Israel.

33. Καὶ ἀπολαβόμενος αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου κατ' ἰδίαν, ἔβαλεν τοὺς δακτύλους αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰ ὦτα αὐτοῦ, καὶ πτύσας, ἤψατο τῆς γλώσσης αὐτοῦ,

34. Καὶ ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν, ἐστέναξεν, καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ: Ἐφφαθά, ὃ ἐστίν, διανοίχθητι.

35. Καὶ ἠνοίγησαν αὐτοῦ αἱ ἀκοαί, καὶ ἐλύθη ὁ δεσμὸς τῆς γλώσσης αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐλάλει ὀρθῶς.

36. Καὶ διεστείλατο αὐτοῖς ἵνα μηδενὶ λέγωσιν, ὅσον δὲ αὐτοῖς διεστέλλετο, αὐτοὶ μᾶλλον περισσώτερον ἐκήρυσσον.

37. Καὶ ὑπερπερισσῶς ἐξεπλήσσοντο, λέγοντες: Καλῶς πάντα πεποίηκεν, ὡς καὶ τοὺς κωφοὺς ποιεῖ ἀκούειν, καὶ ἀλάλους λαλεῖν.

31. And again he went out from the borders of Tyre, and came through Sidon unto the sea of Galilee, through the midst of the borders of Decapolis.

32. And they bring unto him one that was deaf, and dumb; and they beseech him to lay his hand upon him.

33. And he took him aside from the multitude privately, and put his fingers into his ears, and he spat, and touched his tongue;

34. And looking up to Heaven, he sighed, and saith unto him: Ephphatha, that is, Be opened.

35. And his ears were opened and the bond of his tongue was loosed, and he spoke aright.

36. And he charged them that they should tell no man: but the more he charged them, so much the more a great deal they published it.

37. And they were beyond measure astonished, saying: He hath done all things well: he maketh even the deaf to hear, and the dumb to speak.

In the thirty-first verse of Matthew, B has *κωφοὺς ἀκούοντας*. The greater number of codices have *λαλοῦντας* which is approved by Tischendorf.

In the thirty-first verse of Mark the reading, *ἦλθεν διὰ Σιδῶνος* is found in **ℵ**, B, D, L, Δ, 33, the Vulgate, Bohainic Ethiopian versions, and in the Syriac Evangelistary of Jerusalem. In A, N, X, Γ, Π, et al., is found the reading, *ἐκ τῶν ὁρίων Τύρου καὶ Σιδῶνος ἦλθε πρὸς κτλ.* This is followed by the Syriac, Gothic and Armenian versions. In Verse thirty-five *εὐθέως* is inserted before *ἡνοίγησαν* in many codices, and in all the old versions except the Coptic. It is not found in **ℵ**, B, D, L, Δ, 33 and 102.

It is not stated what length of time Jesus remained in the territory of Tyre and Sidon. We believe however that he spent some considerable time there to be away from the machinations of the Pharisees, and also to give his Apostles that rest to which he had invited them. When he departed thence, he journeyed northward from the region round about Tyre through Sidon, and then he turned southeastward through the region of Mt. Lebanon, going to the south of the Great Hermon, perhaps through Cæsarea Philippi, thence south-eastward through Decapolis, and finally turning to the southward, he came to the Sea of Galilee on its northeastern border, very probably in the region where he had wrought the first multiplication of the loaves. This region was a desert; and the Lord went up into a mountain, and sat down. His presence there soon

becomes known far and wide, and straightway the multitudes begin to come to him bringing with them the lame, blind, dumb, maimed, and many others, and he heals them.

The Christ of prophecy was to be a miracle-worker, a healer of the ills of men. God's fulfilment of a promise is always a perfect and abundant fulfilment. Many times in the Gospels events like this are recorded, where Jesus healed every species of human ill of the multitudes who came to him. The mere healing was not Christ's real work. He was working for the generations of men of all time; he was placing in the records of men an evidence that there is no power above the power of the Son of God, and inviting all men to seek in the spiritual order of being the effects of which these corporal healings were mere types.

If our eyes could be opened, and we could see human beings as they are members of the spiritual order of things, what a fearful view would open to our gaze? If we see a man who is blind, or deaf, or maimed in any member, we pity the wretched condition of such a one. And perhaps we who look on at such bodily infirmities are greater sufferers in the world of our souls. Society speaks high praise of any movement or system that tends to alleviate bodily misery; and no thought is given to do aught for the diseases of the soul. In the past century great advancement has been made in enhancing the enjoyableness of human life, considered in its earthly aspect; while retrogression has been the order of movement in the spiritual life. The multiplied inventions of man, the effects of our material civilization, all increase the joy of man's animal life, and draw man away from the world of spirit. The more a man has here, the harder it is for him to lift up his heart to God, and to the spiritual world. If the Creator had said to man: "Thou art a mere body; thy period of life shall be limited to a certain number of years; and then thy existence shall absolutely cease," man might have some justification for giving his exclusive interest to the present order of things; but how sad and hopeless would be our lives! But instead of that the Creator has in substance said to man: "Thou art a spirit in a body; this is thy larval state; hold to nothing here; thy body must die, and be resolved to dust, and arise again; but

thy spirit is ordained to live forever." And yet man gives the strength of his thought and the strength of his labor for the things of the body, and neglects that which alone is great and enduring in human life.

The power of the Lord Jesus remains on earth to heal all spiritual ills; and yet we find that the multitudes come not to him with that great eagerness to receive spiritual healing. And behold the foolishness of it. A man may lose his body; he has lost nothing; it was a mere time-vesture, a larva. But if his spirit loses its life, all is lost. And man will think, and plan and labor, and endure,—yea and sin, that the body may have things which it can enjoy, at most, for a few years; and he has little or no interest in the *Summum Bonum* that his spirit can enjoy for an eternity. This is the saddest act in the human comedy.

Mark selects one of the many healed on that occasion, and describes his healing in detail. The man was deaf, κωφός, but concerning the disability of his speech, authorities are not agreed. The term used by St. Mark to describe this disability is μογιλάλος. The term is composed of μόγῃς, corresponding to the Latin *vix, ægre, magno cum labore*, and λάλος, *loquens*. Many interpreters accept the strict etymological sense of the word, and render the term *one who had an impediment in his speech*. This opinion is supported by Cajetan, Salmeron, Maldonatus, Jansenius, Cornelius à Lapide, Calmet, Patrizi, Schegg, and Fillion. It is also adopted by the Revised Edition of Oxford.

Notwithstanding the weight of these excellent authorities, we are persuaded that the Vulgate translation is to be preferred, which renders the term by *mutus, mute*.

In the first place, though μογιλάλος etymologically means one having an impediment in speech, it is certain that may also mean a mute. In the sixth verse of the thirty-fifth chapter of Isaiah there occurs the phrase: "—and the tongue of the dumb shall sing." All authorities are agreed that *dumb* is the correct rendering here of the Hebrew דִּמְיוֹ, and the Septuagint renders the term by μογιλάλος.

This is an argument that the term may designate a mute.

Moreover there is also evidence in the account that it must mean a mute. The disability in speech is mentioned in such a connection with the man's deafness that it appears evident that the lack of speech was a consequence of the lack of hearing. *Κωφός* in the New Testament invariably denotes one congenitally deaf. And in such cases complete absence of speech would necessarily follow. The two defects have a mutual interdependence, and in other miracles of this character wrought by the Lord, the subjects are deaf and dumb. Again, the miracle would be greater, if wrought on a man congenitally deaf and dumb, and out of the many miracles, Mark would not have chosen the least striking as a specimen of Jesus' power. Mark says in the thirty-seventh verse that the people declared that Jesus had made the dumb to speak, and the only fact that he narrates to justify this popular declaration is the cure of the *μογιλάλος*.

Our opinion has the endorsement of Schleusner, Weiss, Keil, Schanz, Knabenbauer, and others.

As the poor mute could not speak for himself, others besought the Lord to lay his hand upon him.

From old time the persuasion has been fixed in the minds of men that the imposition of hands is a fitting human action by which divine power may be communicated to a subject. It is so easy and natural to conceive the hand as the instrument of the higher power to work these high effects.

Jesus Christ did not always work his miracles in the same manner. Sometimes he heals the sick, expels demons, and raises the dead by his sole word. Then at other times he makes use of the contact of his sacred hands, or of his spittle, or of the clay of the earth. When he heals by his sole word, he emphasizes the absoluteness of his power over all things; when he uses any sensible means, he helps us to realize the effect operated. Our minds in their present state ordinarily use sensible phantasms in conceiving ideas; and the effect of divine power is more readily apprehended when it is joined with some outward sensible sign. Following the example of the Lord, the Church joins invisible spiritual effects to sensible signs, and uses symbols to teach spiritual truth.

The Lord took the man apart from the crowd. He was about to perform a religious act; and reverence for it demanded that it should not be thrust too rudely out into the vulgar arena. Again, the Lord sought no human praise from his miracles, and he shunned all human recognition, as far as was compatible with the great design of teaching the world that he was the Son of God.

Jesus next puts his fingers into the ears of the deaf mute. The sensible sign was that he opened up the clogged passages; the supernatural fact was that divine power proceeding from the sacred humanity of Jesus, restored the organs to a perfectly healthy condition. The sensible action of inserting the fingers into the ears helps a man to realize the supernatural effect.

The Lord next touched the tongue of the mute with his saliva. Schegg believes that the Lord directly spat into the mouth of the mute. It seems more probable that the Lord withdrew his fingers from the man's ears, and moistening them with his spittle, touched the man's tongue.

There is a fitness here also in the sensible sign. The saliva having come in contact with the sacred tongue of Our Lord had the power to take away the disability of the mute's tongue.

The Lord next looks up to Heaven, to show the man and all men that the source whence the miraculous healing came was the throne of God. So, when we need help, he would have us look up to Heaven.

The Lord Jesus, while looking up to Heaven, groans, to express the vehemence of his prayer. He did not need to groan for himself; but he was our teacher, and he has shown us in this action what should be our earnestness when asking aid from God. Jesus now pronounces one word. The Greek transliteration of this word is *ἐφφαθά*. Neubauer derives this from *הִפְתָּהּ*, the imperative niphal of *פָּתַח*.

The sense of such imperative is: "Be thou opened."

Most authorities derive *ἐφφαθά* from *הִפְתָּהּ*, the imperative of the Aramaic *hithpaël* of the same root. *Hithpaël* is reflexive; and in this acceptation the sense would be: "Open

thymself." This latter opinion has the greater probability.

The Lord spoke, and it was done. The man's ears were opened; the bond of his tongue was loosed, and he heard and spoke aright.

From the fact that Mark does not say that the man spoke, but that he spoke aright, some seek to find therein proof that the man was not a mute, but impeded in speech. They believe that St. Mark, in writing that the man spoke aright, calls attention by contrast to the man's former condition, in which he spoke, but not plainly. But we believe that St. Mark, by thus describing the man's condition after the miraculous healing, wishes to call attention to the additional miracle whereby a man who had never learned human speech recovers not only the ability to utter articulate sounds, but the full faculty of speech, so that he could speak with the same correctness as though he had always spoken. Besides it is hereby declared that the effect of the Lord's action was a perfect restoration.

It seems to us also that the great admiration of the people is best explained in the supposition that the man was mute.

In keeping with this general plan, Jesus charged the witnesses of this miracle to tell no man. His object was to shun all human fame and popularity. He wishes also thereby to instruct us to shun the human praise and glory that may result from any good work that we do. The people conjecturing that Jesus thus endeavored to shun the popular recognition of his deed through humility, obeyed not the Lord's injunction; but on the contrary published the deed all the more by reason of the Lord's prohibition; for his humility heightened the people's admiration of the Lord, and impelled them to make known his wonderful works. The people committed no wrong in acting contrary to the Lord's wishes. It was not a formal act of disobedience. The Lord wished to renounce his right to have his deed known to the people. The witnesses of the miracle, or rather miracles, for many were healed, being filled with gratitude and devotion to their great Prophet, would not let him accomplish the effect of his renunciation.

The fact that Jesus foreknew that the people would publish his deed does not import any lack of sincerity in the Lord's words. He desired to avoid the publication of the miracles; he did all that in the ordinary conduct of men could be done to prevent the publication. He is our model in this; and when like him we honestly desire our good deeds to remain hid, and when we do what in us lies to keep them from the knowledge of the public, that publicity which may be forced upon us will not take aught from the excellence of any good work.

MATT. XV. 32—39

32. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς προσκαλεσάμενος τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ, εἶπεν: Σπλαγχνίζομαι ἐπὶ τὸν ὄχλον, ὅτι ἡμέραι τρεῖς προσμένουσιν με, καὶ οὐκ ἔχουσιν τι φάγωσιν, καὶ ἀπολύσαι αὐτοὺς νήστεις οὐ θέλω, μήποτε ἐκλυθῶσιν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ.

33. Καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταί: Πόθεν ἡμῖν ἐν ἐρημίᾳ ἄρτοι τοσοῦτοι, ὥστε χορτάσαι ὄχλον τοσοῦτον;

34. Καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς: Πόσους ἄρτους ἔχετε; οἱ δὲ εἶπον: Ἑπτὰ, καὶ ὀλίγα ἰχθύδια.

35. Καὶ παραγγείλας τῷ ὄχλῳ ἀναπεσεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν,

36. Ἔλαβεν τοὺς ἑπτὰ ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς ἰχθύας, καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν, καὶ ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς, οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ τοῖς ὄχλοις.

MARK VIII. 1—10

1. Ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις, πάλιν πολλοῦ ὄχλου ὄντος, καὶ μὴ ἐχόντων τι φάγωσιν, προσκαλεσάμενος τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ, λέγει αὐτοῖς.

2. Σπλαγχνίζομαι ἐπὶ τὸν ὄχλον, ὅτι ἤδη ἡμέραις τρισὶν προσμένουσιν, καὶ οὐκ ἔχουσιν τι φάγωσιν.

3. Καὶ ἂν ἀπολύσω αὐτοὺς νήστεις εἰς οἶκον αὐτῶν, ἐκλυθήσονται ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ, καὶ τινὲς αὐτῶν ἀπὸ μακρόθεν εἰσὶν.

4. Καὶ ἀπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ: Ὅτι πόθεν τούτους δυνήσεται τις ὧδε χορτάσαι ἄρτων ἐπ' ἐρημίας;

5. Καὶ ἠρώτα αὐτούς: Πόσους ἔχετε ἄρτους; οἱ δὲ εἶπαν: Ἑπτὰ.

6. Καὶ παραγγέλλει τῷ ὄχλῳ ἀναπεσεῖν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, καὶ λαβὼν τοὺς ἑπτὰ ἄρτους, εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν, καὶ ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ, ἵνα παρατίθωσιν, καὶ παρέθηκαν τῷ ὄχλῳ.

7. Καὶ εἶχαν ἰχθύδια ὀλίγα, καὶ εὐλογήσας αὐτὰ, εἶπεν καὶ ταῦτα παρατιθέναι.

37. Καὶ ἔφαγον πάντες, καὶ ἐχορτάσθησαν, καὶ τὸ περισσεῦον τῶν κλασμάτων ἦσαν, ἑπτὰ σφυρίδας πλήρεις.

38. Οἱ δὲ ἐσθίοντες ἦσαν ὡς τετρακισχίλιοι ἄνδρες, χωρὶς γυναικῶν καὶ παιδίων.

39. Καὶ ἀπολύσας τοὺς ὄχλους, ἐνέβη εἰς τὸ πλοῖον, καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς τὰ ὄρια Μαγαδάν.

32. And Jesus called unto him his disciples, and said I have compassion on the multitude, because they continue with me now three days and have nothing to eat: and I would not send them away fasting, lest haply they faint in the way.

33. And the disciples say unto him: Whence should we have so many loaves in a desert place, as to fill so great a multitude?

34. And Jesus saith unto them: How many loaves have ye? And they said: Seven, and a few small fishes.

35. And he commanded the multitude to sit down on the ground;

36. And he took the seven loaves and the fishes; and he gave thanks and broke, and gave to the disciples, and the disciples gave to the multitudes.

8. Καὶ ἔφαγον, καὶ ἐχορτάσθησαν, καὶ ἦσαν περισσεύματα κλασμάτων, ἑπτὰ σφυρίδας.

9. Ἦσαν δὲ ὡς τετρακισχίλιοι, καὶ ἀπέλυσεν αὐτούς.

10. Καὶ εὐθὺς ἐμβὰς αὐτὸς εἰς τὸ πλοῖον μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ, ἦλθεν εἰς τὰ μέρη Δαλμανουθά.

1. In those days, when there was again a great multitude, and they had nothing to eat, he called unto him his disciples, and saith unto them:

2. I have compassion on the multitude, because they continue with me now three days, and have nothing to eat:

3. And if I send them away fasting to their home, they will faint in the way: and some of them are come from far.

4. And his disciples answered him: Whence shall one be able to fill these men with bread here in a desert place?

5. And he asked them: How many loaves have ye? And they said: Seven.

6. And he commandeth the multitude to sit down on the ground: and he took the seven loaves, and having given thanks, he broke, and gave to his disciples, to set before them; and they set them before the multitude.

7. And they had a few small fishes: and having blessed them, he commanded to set these also before them.

37. And they did all eat, and were filled: and they took up that which remained over of the broken pieces, seven baskets full.

38. And they that did eat were four thousand men, beside women and children.

39. And he sent away the multitudes, and entered into a boat, and came into the borders of Magadan.

8. And they did eat, and were filled: and they took up, of broken pieces that remained over, seven baskets.

9. And they were about four thousand: and he sent them away.

10. And straightway he entered into the boat with his disciples, and came into the parts of Dalmanutha.

In verse thirty-two of Matthew the best codices have ἡδη ἡμέραι and this reading is supported by Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort. \aleph has ἡμέρας. In Verse thirty-five τῷ ὄχλῳ is the reading of \aleph , B, D, et al. The other authorities have τοῖς ὄχλοις. In the thirty-sixth verse the exact reverse is verified; \aleph , B, D et al. have the plural τοῖς ὄχλοις, and the other authorities have the singular τῷ ὄχλῳ. In verse thirty-eight, B and some cursive manuscripts place ὥς before τετρακισχίλιοι. Great variety exists in the codices in regard to the name of the city mentioned in the thirty-ninth verse of Matthew. C and M render it Μαγδαλάν: E, F, G, H, K, L, S, U, V, X, Γ , Δ , Π , et al. have Μαγδαλά. \aleph , B, and D have Μαγαδάν.

In the first verse of Mark's text πάλιν πολλοῦ is found in \aleph , B, D, G, L, M, \aleph , Δ , and in the versions. Some codices have παμπόλλου. In Verse three, καὶ τινες is the reading of \aleph , B, L, D, et al.; τινὲς γάρ is found in A, N, X, Γ , Π , et al. This reading is followed by the Vulgate, the Syro-hexaplar Syriac, the Gothic, Armenian and Ethiopian versions. The final verb in the same verse is εἰσὶν in B, L, and D. This reading is approved by Westcott and Hort. The greater number of authorities support ἦκασι. In Verse six, παραγγέλλει is found in \aleph , B, D, L and Δ . This reading is also followed by some codices of the Vulgate. A, C, N, X, Γ , Π ,

et al, have *παρήγγειλε*. In Verse nine, A, C, D, F, X, Γ, Π, et al. add *οἱ φαγόντες*. This reading is followed by most of the old versions.

Though this miraculous multiplication of loaves and fishes is in many points very like to the other event which preceded the great discourse on the Eucharist, yet it has strong features of dissimilarity. In the former event the miracle was wrought on the evening of the first day; here it is on the third day. In the first event five loaves and two fishes are offered; in the present event the number of fishes is not determined, but it is stated that they were few, and the loaves are seven. By the first miracle Christ fed five thousand men; here the number is only four thousand. Moreover, in the first multiplication there were left twelve baskets of fragments; while in this event the number of the baskets is seven.

Hence without foundation, recent protestant writers have asserted that the two passages are modified accounts of the same event. There is certainly no intrinsic improbability in the statement that Christ twice multiplied bread. In Mark, VIII. 19-20, Jesus reminds the Apostles of the two miracles, and they describe one distinguishing feature wherein the two miracles differed.

It is evident that the second multiplication of the loaves and fishes was wrought in the same place where he had healed the multitudes. For three days the people had remained with Jesus there in the wilderness. He had taught them many things not recorded in the Gospels; he had healed their sick; and now he finds that they are without food.

The account does not imply that the people had been three days without food, but that they had remained with Jesus three days, and had in that time consumed all their food; and were on the third day unprovided with anything to eat.

Jesus now calls his Apostles, and takes counsel with them as to what to do. He expresses to them the strong feelings of compassion that he feels for the poor people, and his unwillingness to send them away hungry. Many of the people had come from afar, and there was no village near where they could procure bread.

And again we find the Apostles slow to believe. They had been witnesses of the Lord's power in a similar event not long before. But they halt and allege the utter impossibility of relieving the hunger of the people there in the desert. This is one of the greatest of man's defects in his relations to his Maker, his slowness to believe; the Apostles are not free from the great defect of men. We are not slow to condemn the Apostles for their lack of faith on this occasion; but in what are we more believing than they? They had evidence, and so have we. The message has come to us more clearly than it was made known then, and how little it moves us! We are created for one thing; we are bidden seek only one thing; and we seek everything else but that. The thoughts that burn within us are not the thoughts of God and Heaven, but the thoughts of our success and of earthly possessions. We are ready to question, doubt, and complain, if ever the ways of God transcend our little intelligence. We know that after a few years an eternal state of being shall be assigned to us, and that this state shall be Heaven or hell; and yet it is not that state which we shall possess for ever that we are pursuing, but what we can attach to ourselves during the few years in which we are on the way thitherward.

Christ submitted the issue to the Apostles to try their faith, and also to present to all generations an account of all the chief features of the event. The magnitude of the miracle appears in clearer light through the declaration of the Apostles.

For a similar reason Jesus asks the Apostles how many loaves have they. By thus ascertaining the amount of food actually available, a certain fitting order is preserved, and the nature of the miracle is more clearly understood.

And the Apostles answered; "Seven [loaves] and a few small fishes."

Jesus commands the multitudes to sit down upon the ground; and then he blesses the bread and fishes, and gives them to the Apostles to distribute to the people. And all that great multitude ate, and were filled, and the Apostles gathered up seven baskets of fragments. St. Matthew informs us that the number of those who were fed was four thousand, beside the women and children.

The multiplication of the bread and fishes takes place in a secret way while the things are being distributed to the people by the Apostles.

The fact that the Apostles had distributed with their own hands this bread to the people more forcibly impressed the event on the Apostles' minds. One better remembers an event in which one is an actor.

It is worthy of note that the number of baskets of fragments in this multiplication corresponds to the number of loaves. In the first multiplication the number of baskets of fragments corresponds to the number of Apostles; The association of ideas is aided by this fact. In after years the Apostles could remember that, in the first multiplication of loaves, every man gathered up a basket of fragments; while in the second case the number of the baskets of fragments equalled the number of the loaves.

The moral lessons taught by this event are the same as those which may be drawn from the preceding multiplication; and as these have been explained in the treatment of the first event, they need not be repeated here.

The Lord Jesus avoids the human glory that would have been given him by the multitudes, by immediately dismissing the multitudes, and in a ship with his disciples withdrawing from the place. The point to which Jesus now directed his course is called Magadan in the best codices of St. Matthew; but St. Mark declares that Jesus in the same voyage came into the parts of Dalmanutha.

Though much has been written on this theme, nothing certain has been determined concerning the identification of these places. The name Dalmanutha occurs but this once in the Scriptures; and if the reading Magadan be the genuine reading here, this name also is not found again in Scripture. It is not difficult to reconcile Matthew and Mark in the designation of place. Jesus and his Apostles came by the Sea of Galilee into a tract of country which comprised both Magadan and Dalmanutha, and this same country is designated by Matthew from its relation to Magadan; while Mark fixes its place by referring it to Dalmanutha. The only thing that is required for the accuracy of the narration is that

these two cities or villages should be so situated that a tract of outlying country could be designated by referring it to either of them. Thus, a certain tract of the Syrian seaboard could be called the parts of Tyre, or the parts of Sidon.

Or it may have been that Magadan designated a region whose chief village was Dalmanutha.

It is profitless to try to fix the sites of these places. They have vanished from the earth, and have left no trace. We believe however that they were on the western shore of the Sea of Galilee. In fact, the conjecture of Guerin is probable that Magadan is the modern Medjdel on the western shore of the Sea of Galilee in the southern part of Gennesaret.

MATT. XVI. 1—12

1. Καὶ προσελθόντες οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ Σαδδουκαῖοι, πειράζοντες ἐπηρώτησαν αὐτὸν σημεῖον ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐπιδειξάιναι αὐτοῖς.

2. Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς. [Ὁψίας γενομένης λέγετε: Εὐδία, πυρράζει γὰρ ὁ οὐρανός.

3. Καὶ πρωί: Σήμερον χειμῶν, πυρράζει γὰρ στυγνάζων ὁ οὐρανός. Τὸ μὲν πρόσωπον τοῦ οὐρανοῦ γινώσκετε διακρίνειν, τὰ δὲ σημεῖα τῶν καιρῶν οὐ δύνασθε.] Γενεὰ πονηρὰ καὶ μοιχαλὶς σημεῖον αἰτεῖ, καὶ σημεῖον οὐ δοθήσεται αὐτῇ, εἰ μὴ τὸ σημεῖον Ἰωανᾶ.

4. Καὶ καταλιπὼν αὐτοὺς ἀπῆλθεν.

5. Καὶ ἐλθόντες οἱ μαθηταὶ εἰς τὸ πέραν, ἐπελάθοντο λαβεῖν ἄρτους.

6. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς: Ὁρᾶτε καὶ προσέχετε ἀπὸ τῆς ζύμης τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ Σαδδουκαίων.

7. Οἱ δὲ διελογίζοντο ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, λέγοντες: Ὅτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἐλάτουμεν.

MARK VIII. 11—21

11. Καὶ ἐξῆλθον οἱ Φαρισαῖοι, καὶ ἤρξαντο συνητεῖν αὐτῷ, ζητοῦντες παρ' αὐτοῦ σημεῖον ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, πειράζοντες αὐτόν.

12. Καὶ ἀναστενάξας τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ λέγει: Τί ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη ζητεῖ σημεῖον; ἀμὴν λέγω, εἰ δοθήσεται τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτῃ σημεῖον.

13. Καὶ ἀφεὶς αὐτοὺς, πάλιν ἐμβὰς, ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸ πέραν.

14. Καὶ ἐπελάθοντο λαβεῖν ἄρτους, καὶ εἰ μὴ ἓνα ἄρτον οὐκ εἶχον μεθ' ἑαυτῶν ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ.

15. Καὶ διεστέλλετο αὐτοῖς, λέγων: Ὁρᾶτε, βλέπετε ἀπὸ τῆς ζύμης τῶν Φαρισαίων, καὶ τῆς ζύμης Ἡρώδου.

16. Καὶ διελογίζοντο πρὸς ἀλλήλους, ὅτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἔχουσιν.

8. Γνοὺς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν: Τί διαλογίζεσθε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, ὀλιγόπιστοι, ὅτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἔχετε;

9. Οὕτω νοεῖτε, οὐδὲ μνημονεύετε τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους τῶν πεντακισχιλίων, καὶ πόσους κοφίνους ἐλάβετε;

10. Οὐδὲ τοὺς ἑπτὰ ἄρτους τῶν τετρακισχιλίων, καὶ πόσας σφυρίδας ἐλάβετε;

11. Πῶς οὐ νοεῖτε, ὅτι οὐ περὶ ἄρτων εἶπον ὑμῖν; Προσέχετε δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς ζύμης τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ Σαδδουκαίων.

12. Τότε συνῆκαν, ὅτι οὐκ εἶπεν προσέχειν ἀπὸ τῆς ζύμης τῶν ἄρτων ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τῆς διδαχῆς τῶν Σαδδουκαίων καὶ Φαρισαίων.

1. And the Pharisees and Sadducees came, and tempting him asked him to shew them a sign from Heaven.

2. But he answered and said unto them: When it is evening, ye say: It will be fair weather: for the heaven is red.

3. And in the morning: It will be foul weather to-day: for the heaven is red and lowering. Ye know how to discern the face of the heaven; but ye cannot discern the signs of the times.

4. An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given

17. Καὶ γνοὺς, λέγει αὐτοῖς: Τί διαλογίζεσθε, ὅτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἔχετε; οὕτω νοεῖτε, οὐδὲ συνίετε; πεπωρωμένην ἔχετε τὴν καρδίαν ὑμῶν;

18. Ὁφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντες οὐ βλέπετε; καὶ ὦτα ἔχοντες οὐκ ἀκούετε; καὶ οὐ μνημονεύετε;

19. Ὅτε τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους ἔκλασα εἰς τοὺς πεντακισχιλίους, πόσους κοφίνους κλασμάτων πλήρεις ἦρατε; λέγουσιν αὐτῷ: Δώδεκα.

20. Ὅτε τοὺς ἑπτὰ εἰς τοὺς τετρακισχιλίους, πόσων σφυρίδων πληρώματα κλασμάτων ἦρατε; καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ ἑπτὰ.

21. Καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς: Πῶς οὐ νοεῖτε;

11. And the Pharisees came forth, and began to question with him, seeking of him a sign from Heaven, tempting him.

12. And he sighed deeply in his spirit, and saith: Why doth this generation seek a sign?

unto it, but the sign of Jonah.
And he left them, and departed.

5. And the disciples came
to the other side and forgot to
take bread.

6. And Jesus said unto
them: Take heed and beware
of the leaven of the Pharisees
and Sadducees.

7. And they reasoned
among themselves, saying: We
took no bread.

8. And Jesus perceiving it
said: O ye of little faith, why
reason ye among yourselves,
because ye have no bread?

9. Do ye not yet perceive,
neither remember the five loaves
of the five thousand, and how
many baskets ye took up?

10. Neither the seven loaves
of the four thousand, and how
many baskets ye took up?

11. How is it that ye do
not perceive that I spoke not
to you concerning bread? But
beware of the leaven of the
Pharisees and Sadducees.

verily I say unto you: There
shall no sign be given unto this
generation.

13. And he left them, and
again entering into the boat
departed to the other side.

14. And they forgot to take
bread; and they had not in the
boat with them more than one
loaf.

15. And he charged them,
saying: Take heed, beware of
the leaven of the Pharisees and
the leaven of Herod.

16. And they reasoned one
with another, saying: We have
no bread.

17. And Jesus perceiving it
saith unto them: Why reason
ye, because ye have no bread?
do ye not yet perceive, neither
understand? have ye your heart
hardened?

18. Having eyes, see ye not?
and having ears, hear ye not?
and do ye not remember?

19. When I broke the five
loaves among the five thousand,
how many baskets full of broken
pieces took ye up? They say
unto him: Twelve.

20. And when the seven
among the four thousand, how
many basketfuls of broken pieces
took ye up? And they say
unto him: Seven.

21. And he said unto them:
Do ye not yet understand?

12. Then they understood how that he bade them not beware of the leaven of bread but of the teaching of the Pharisees and Sadducees.

In the text of Matthew, the entire passage from *ὁψίας* of the second verse to *δύνασθε* at the end of the third verse is omitted in **ℵ**, B, V, X, and Γ. It is also omitted in the Curetonian Syriac, the Armenian version, and by Origen. Jerome declares that the passage was not found in many codices which he had seen. The passage is supported by the authority of C, D, G, H, K, L, M, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Π, and of many cursive manuscripts. The Vulgate, the Peshitto, the Coptic and the Ethiopian versions, Eusebius, Chrysostom, Theophylactus, Euthymius and Hilary endorse it. The term *προφήτου* is added to the fourth verse in C, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Π et al. It is also found in the Coptic, Armenian and Ethiopian versions, and in all the Syriac versions. In the eighth verse *ἔχετε* is found in **ℵ**, B, and D; nearly all the other authorities have *ἐλάβετε*, which is approved by Tischendorf. In the twelfth verse the plural *τῶν ἄρτων* is found in **ℵ**^c, B, and in other authorities. The text edited by Robert Etienne has the singular *τοῦ ἄρτου*.

In the twelfth verse of Mark, B and L omit *ὑμῖν*. In Verse thirteen *εἰς τὸ πλοῖον* is added in A, E, F, G, H, K, M, N, S, X, U, F, Π, et al.

In the sixteenth Verse *λέγοντες* is found in A, C, L, N, X, Γ, Δ, Π, et al. It is adopted by all the old versions. In the same verse *ἔχουσιν* is the reading of B; the great body of codices have *ἔχομεν*. In Verse seventeen *ἔτι* is placed before *πεπρωμένην* in A, X, Γ, Π, et al. This reading is followed by the Vulgate and Syriac versions, and approved by Tischendorf. In Verse twenty-one *οὐπω συνίετε* is found in **ℵ**, C, K, L, Δ, Π, and in some cursive manuscripts. This is approved by Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort. *Πῶς οὐ νοεῖτε* is the reading of B, E, F, G, H, S, V, F, et al. This is followed by a few codices of the Vetus Itala, and by the Coptic and Ethiopian versions. We find *πῶς οὐπω* in A, D,

M, N, U, X and many other uncial codices. This is followed by the Syriac, Vulgate, Gothic and Armenian versions.

When Jesus and his Apostles had come into the parts of Dalmanutha, representatives of the two leading Jewish sects came to him, and asked him for a sign from Heaven to prove that he was the Messiah. The motives of these sectaries in asking for this sign from Heaven was thoroughly dishonest. If the miracle had been wrought, they would declare, as they did at other times, that Jesus worked miracles by the power of Beelzebub.

At this juncture in the life of Jesus, the whole Jewish people could testify of his miracles. He had healed multitudes in the sight of the people; he had driven out the demons from many demonized persons; he had raised the widow's son at Naim before the eyes of the whole populace of the village. And yet these hypocrites with brazen effrontery come, and ask for a sign from Heaven.

And Jesus unveils their dishonesty by contrasting their ability to judge of meteorological phenomena with their voluntary blindness in regard to the abundant evidences of his divine character. It was equivalent to saying: "When ye wish to see the truth, ye are shrewd and accurate in observation; but when ye hate the truth, and strive not to see it, no evidence will avail."

St. Mark declares that, at the dishonest demand of the sectaries, Jesus sighed deeply in his spirit. That is to say, Jesus heaved a deep sigh or groan of anguish to find such perfidy and obstinate malice in man, whom he had come down from Heaven to save. The utter baseness of these men drew forth from the depths of his being this expression of pain at the fallen estate of these leaders of Israel.

Mark omits the passage found in St. Matthew, wherein Jesus speaks of the signs of fair weather and the signs of foul weather. For this cause also many codices of Matthew omit the passage. But the fact that a passage of such character is found in a large number of uncial codices of good authority, and also is found in nearly all the old versions and in the writings of many Fathers, both Greek and Latin, assures us of its genuineness. That it is omitted in some

codices is a fact easy to explain: very often by omissions the copyists tried to bring the evangelists into a close agreement. Perhaps also in perplexity over the exact import of the passage some copyists omitted it. But on the other hand, a passage of such nature nowhere else found in the Scriptures could not have been interpolated into all the authorities that support it.

A popular weather observation with the Jews was that when at sunset the heavens became red, it was a sign that the morrow would be fair; on the contrary, when at sunrise, the heavens were overcast with clouds, and these clouds were red and lowering, it was an indication of the approach of foul weather.

Jesus gave no endorsement to the value of these signs; he simply called attention to the fact that the Jews observed them, and based on them calculations of the weather.

But, in fact, these signs are observed yet by many people, and they truly indicate the quality of the weather which will follow.

As these signs in the heavens indicated coming events, so there were abundant signs that the time of the Messiah had come, and that Jesus was that Messiah. In the first place, the scepter had passed from Judah; the period of time predicted by Daniel was drawing to a close; the prophecies of the Old Law were fulfilled in Christ; and his miracles were of such a character that he could say to the people: "If ye are unwilling to accept my words, believe my works; for they testify of me."

The Jews failed to believe in Jesus, because they positively refused to believe. No matter how bright the light is, if a man closes his eyes, he can not see. The defect can not be remedied by increasing the light; the man must open his eyes.

Jesus now openly declares that he will not give a sign, and he also declares the reason. Those who ask the sign are an evil and adulterous generation.

The term adulterous is here used to denote not the specific sin of the unlawful carnal union of man and woman, but to denote that Israel, the bride of Yahveh, was unfaithful to her

Lord. Many a time and oft did Yahveh rebuke Israel's unfaithfulness under the figure of this sin. Jesus Christ never granted a miracle to men disposed in mind as were these Pharisees and Sadducees. Miracles are given in response to the petition of faith, or to produce and promote faith in honest hearts, and it would be like casting pearls before swine to accede to the arrogant demands of these sectaries. And also there are conditions of soul verified among the men of our day which repel the action of God, and for such God will not do anything. More time and attention should be given by man to the examination and determination of the status of his soul as it appears before God. Man should not be content with anything less than the highest certainty attainable that his soul is in a healthy spiritual condition, that it is rightly disposed to receive the action of God, and that it is fulfilling the purpose which God ordained for it in its creation.

In the Greek text of Mark there is a characteristic Hebrew idiom in the twelfth verse, in which *ei, ij*, is used for a negative. It corresponds to the Hebrew **אין**, which after verbs of declaring, swearing, etc., is equivalent to the negative particle.

Though the Lord denies to the Pharisees any specific miracle for their special benefit, he declares that there shall be given to them the great sign of Jonah. This sign was the burial of Jesus in the tomb, and his resurrection thence on the third day. It is called the sign of Jonah, because as Jonah was three days in the belly of the whale, and came out thence on the third day, so Christ was in the bosom of the earth until the third day, on which he arose from the dead.

In the mind of Jesus this was the grand miracle and proof of his mission. It was the final act in the victory over sin and death. It was the transition from Jesus' life of suffering and atonement to his life of glory and of reigning with his elect. It was greater than all preceding miracles, because by it a greater power was overcome. It was like the creation of another universe, the universe of the elect who shall arise from the dead. It is a miracle of great importance for us, because our lives are full of hope only inasmuch as we hope to share in that great miracle. This sign was given to the Pharisees, inasmuch

as it was a universal miracle, a fact presented to the whole world, to which all men could look for proof that Jesus was the Son of God; and that believing they might have life in his name.

Being filled with just indignation against the sectaries, Jesus leaves them, and with his little band again enters a boat, and sets out for the other side of the lake.

As Magadan and Dalmanutha were on the western shore of the lake, in this voyage Jesus and his Apostles directed their course towards the eastern shore of the lake. The Apostles are troubled by the fact that they have no bread for the eastern shore of the lake was wild and uninhabited in many places, and for this reason there had been necessity on one occasion for Jesus to multiply the loaves and fishes to feed the multitudes on that same eastern shore.

And the Apostles entered into the boat, and set out on the voyage, having forgotten to provide bread.

It seems that they had not proceeded far before they noticed the defect of bread, and they became troubled thereat. Their minds are preoccupied by this worry, and Jesus knows it. As they move forward in the boat over the calm waters of the Sea of Galilee, Jesus makes use of the occasion to teach his Apostles. And among other things Jesus declared unto them: "Take heed and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees."

In his relation, Mark makes no mention of the Sadducees, but records that Jesus warned his Apostles against the leaven of the Pharisees, and the leaven of Herod. There are several ways of reconciling this discrepancy. It is not to be thought that Jesus uttered only this one sentence. A notable evidence of the hypocrisy of the Pharisees and Sadducees had been given in the event which preceded the embarkation, and very probably Jesus took this fact as a theme of moral teaching. In his discourse he may have mentioned Herod in association with the Pharisees and Sadducees. Now as the writers relate the events as they remembered them, it may have been that in the mind of Matthew the deepest impression may have been made by the mention of the two great Jewish sects; while

Peter, from whom Mark received his data, preserved the memory of Jesus' mention of Herod.

Again we know that Herod became identified with a sect who were called Herodians. These were also unfriendly to Jesus, and at times made common cause with the Pharisees to destroy Jesus Christ. They were subtle intriguers, who especially aimed to overthrow the Roman domination in Syria. The character of these men differed in nothing from that of the other sectaries. In fact, it may be that the Sadducees themselves formed this party of Herod, and thus became denominated Herodians from his name. Flavius Josephus does not mention the sect of the Herodians; hence we suspect that this title was another designation of the Sadducees, which was given them in the days of Herod Antipas, from the fact that they espoused his secret hostility to Rome.

It was a common figure in Scripture to represent the evil influence of any agent as leaven. Sometimes also the figure of leaven is taken to represent the effect of a good cause operating in human society. Thus Jesus Christ compares the growth of the Church to the action of leaven in a paste. But in the greater number of cases it denotes the evil effect of pernicious principles, whether inculcated by word or by example. Thus Paul: "Know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump?"—I. Cor. V. 6.

Employing the term therefore in this sense, Jesus bids his Apostles beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the other sectaries.

The wisdom of Jesus' caution can be seen at a glance. These sects were powerful in Judæa. They were influenced by one of the worst spirits that can fix itself in the soul of man. Some hope may be entertained of a man who is sincere, even though he be of evil life. But the Pharisees were thoroughly insincere, spiritually dishonest, and under pretence of great religiousness they served the devil. They were shrewd, cunning plotters, and hence any association with them was dangerous to a man's righteousness. Hypocrisy was their trade; and they offered a great insult to God by making use of a semblance of that holy thing, religion, to deceive the people, in order that they might have from the people honor and emolument.

We believe that God hates most the sin that is most opposed to his own divine nature. Now therefore God must hate hypocrisy and feigning in religion, for it mocks God in that essential relation which exists between God and his creature. Hypocrisy is not alone wickedness, it is mean, low, craven, dishonorable, wickedness; it is wickedness without any redeeming qualities. We all know that we prefer an open honorable adversary to a man that is always double, wily, simulating. No evil deed fills us with the disgust of the evil deed of the hypocrite. And God who is essential truth abominates the hypocrite.

Phariseism was firmly fixed in the leaders of the First Covenant; Jesus, the founder of the New Law, endeavors to prevent its entrance into his kingdom. And for this cause he frequently calls attention to this characteristic of the teachers of Israel.

But the minds of the Apostles are preoccupied by the lack of bread. They have but one loaf in the boat, and they are going to a point on the lake where bread can not be obtained, and they fear that they shall be hungry.

When therefore Jesus speaks of the leaven of the Pharisees, the Apostles understand him to speak of material bread. They must have understood that Jesus warned them against eating bread made or sold by the Pharisees or Sadducees. This increases their consternation. They look at one another with looks expressive of their mutual alarm. In low tones some of them converse, and give expression to their troubled thoughts.

Jesus comes at a knowledge of the state of their minds by his power to read the thoughts of men. The presence of this power in Jesus was one of the proofs of his Divinity.

And Jesus gently chides them for their slowness to place their absolute trust in him. How foolish it is to fear hunger or any other evil, when one is with Jesus? Jesus has all power and all willingness to use that power for man's good. It is not a difficult thing to say that Jesus has all power. We can pronounce the sentence in a few seconds of time. But no finite intelligence in an unlimited period of duration can fully comprehend what that sentence imports. All our ideas are circumscribed by limitations, and when we direct our minds to

the attributes of God we lose ourselves on a shoreless sea. And out of such contemplations the thought arises, how much better is the other life than this? and yet we love it less.

The Apostles were reprehensible for two reasons. First, they should not have been anxious for what they should eat, for Jesus was with them, and no evil could come upon them while in his company. They failed somewhat in that absolute trust that Jesus asks should be placed in him.

Secondly, ordinary quickness of comprehension would have made known to them that Jesus was discoursing of moral issues, and not of material bread.

Jesus justly chides the Apostles, declaring them to be men of little faith. His rebuke was necessary to show them the value of faith, and also to arouse them to make use of what he was doing for them to grow in faith.

Faith is begotten in the soul of man by the action of God in conjunction with man's right use of the powers of his mind. Now certainly the action of God was present in the Apostles. The Son of God had selected them to plant faith in the world. But there was a certain torpidity in the Apostles' minds in co-operating with the action of the grace of God; so that Jesus tells them that by this defect they are in some degree like to men who, having the organs of sight and hearing, see not and hear not.

Jesus reminds them of the two miraculous multiplications of loaves, and asks them to bear witness to their own part in the events. For this cause Jesus does not say: "Now many baskets remained?" but: "How many baskets took ye up?" The testimony was greater from the fact that they had been actors in the event.

It is to be observed that whenever the second multiplication of bread is mentioned, the Greek term used to denote the receptacle of the fragments differs from that used in speaking of the first multiplication. In the first multiplication of loaves the term *κόφινος* is employed to signify the baskets; while in every mention of the second multiplication the term *σπυρίς* is invariably used. We believe that the *σπυρίς* was a larger basket than the *κόφινος*. In Acts IX. 25, it is declared that Paul was let down from a window *ἐν σπυρίδι*. Wherefore

it is probable that though, in the second event, the baskets were seven, the quantity of the fragments was greater than in the first miracle.

To make the issue still clearer, after recalling the events of the multiplication of the loaves, Christ openly declares that he spoke not of bread, and he expresses regret that the Apostles should have so grossly mistaken his sense.

One fact of great worth is taught us by the records of the event, namely that the Evangelists ingenuously record facts in all their naked truth, without trying to defend or excuse themselves. There is no self-glorification in what the Evangelists write. They record all their stupid mistakes, their lack of courage, their slowness to believe, their weakness in trial, their difficulty in grasping spiritual ideas. This ingenuousness aids in moving one to believe the records that the Evangelists have written.

The rebuke of Christ had a good effect, and thereupon the Apostles knew that he spoke of the doctrine of the Pharisees and Sadducees.

It is not recorded in what way the defect of bread was supplied, and it is vain to venture any conjectures thereon.

MARK VIII. 22—26.

22. And they come unto Bethsaida. And they bring to him a blind man, and beseech him to touch him.

22. Καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς Βηθσαϊδάν, καὶ φέρουσιν αὐτῷ τυφλόν, καὶ παρακαλοῦσιν αὐτὸν ἵνα αὐτοῦ ἅψηται.

23. And he took hold of the blind man by the hand, and brought him out of the village; and when he had spit on his eyes, and laid his hands upon him, he asked him: Seest thou aught?

23. Καὶ ἐπιλαβόμενος τῆς χειρὸς τοῦ τυφλοῦ, ἐξήνεγκεν αὐτὸν ἔξω τῆς κώμης, καὶ πύσας εἰς τὰ ὄμματα αὐτοῦ, ἐπιθεὶς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῷ, ἐηρώτα αὐτόν: Εἴ τι βλέπεις;

24. And he looked up, and said: I see men; for I behold them as trees, walking.

24. Καὶ ἀναβλέψας ἔλεγεν: Βλέπω τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, ὅτι ὡς δένδρα ὁρῶ περιπατοῦντας.

25. Then again he laid his hands upon his eyes; and he

25. Εἶτα πάλιν ἔθηκεν τὰς χεῖρας ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ,

looked steadfastly, and was re- καὶ διέβλεψεν, καὶ ἀποκατέστη, καὶ
stored, and saw all things ἐνέβλεπεν τηλαυγῶς ἅπαντα.
clearly.

26. And he sent him away 26. Καὶ ἀπέστειλεν αὐτὸν εἰς
to his home, saying: Do not οἶκον αὐτοῦ, λέγων: Μὴ δὲ εἰς τὴν
even enter into the village. κώμην εἰσελθῆς.

In the twenty-second verse of Mark's text *ἔρχεται* appears in **N***, A, N, X, Γ, Π, et al. This reading is followed by the Syriac versions. In Verse twenty-three we find *βλέπεις* in B, C, D*, Δ, the Coptic, Ethiopian, and Revised Version of Oxford. The other authorities have *βλέπει*. In Verse twenty-four C², and D omit *ὅτι* and *ὁρῶ*: the terms are also omitted by the Vulgate, Syriac, Coptic, Armenian and Ethiopian versions. In Verse twenty-six the clause *μηδέ εἶπης τινὶ ἐν τῇ κώμῃ* is found in A, C, N, X, Γ, Δ, Π, et al. This is followed by the Peshitto, Gothic, Ethiopian and Armenian versions. The reading of the Vulgate is only found in some cursive manuscripts.

The record of the healing of this blind man is found in Mark alone, and he gives a detailed account of the event. Some uncertainty exists regarding the site of the miracle. Lamy, Calmet, Schegg, Schanz, Fillion, Keil, and Edersheim, believe that Bethsaida here denotes Bethsaida-Julias. Patrizi and others believe the place to have been Bethsaida near to Capharnaum. It is impossible to decide which place is meant, since no sufficient indications are given by St. Mark. Nothing can be proven from the fact that the place was called a *Κώμη*, as the names *Κώμη* and *πόλις* are attributed to the same place by the writers of the New Testament. Compare Luke II. 4, and John VII. 42. From the fact that St. Mark passes from this event to events done at Cæsarea-Philippi, it seems more probable that Bethsaida-Julias is meant.

And they bring to Jesus a blind man, and they ask Jesus that he would cure him by laying his hands on him. From the fact that the man himself asks not for the benefit, it is generally believed that he was poor, perhaps a beggar, who had not the faith or courage to ask for himself. Whatever faith was back of the request seems to have been the faith of those who bring the blind man to Jesus. Jesus hesitates not an

instant. He is moved by the faith and charity of the men who bring the poor blind man to him. The Son of God was eager to accomplish good. If ever he hesitated to perform an action, it was that the very hesitation might add to the good effects of the action. In this present action the conditions were fit, the action was a good deed, and Jesus moves at once to perform the work of mercy.

We may also draw a lesson from the event, to move with willingness, gentleness, and promptness to the execution of deeds of kindness and mercy. Many a deed of kindness and mercy has been spoiled by the grumbling and bad temper which accompanied it.

With extreme gentleness Jesus took the man by the hand, and led him out of the village. The Lord was unwilling to display his almighty power before the gaze of the people in the village. He was not seeking human applause and renown. He had an absolute right to man's praise, and worship, but as man he shunned all human glory in order to teach us how to live.

What a sight was exhibited to human eyes that day in Bethsaida! Jesus Christ holding by the hand a blind man and leading him forth out of the village in order to restore to him his sight! This was a scene that mortal eye could witness. But grander scenes than this have the eyes of angels witnessed since that day. Often have they seen Jesus leading the sin-blinded soul out of its sinful environment into the light and the peace of the path of righteousness. How often would not we have stumbled, had it not been for his leading? And he would always lead us, and always keep us in his company, if we did not repel him by cold worldliness and by sin. We have a journey to make which we cannot make alone. The way is dark and perilous; the foes are many and strong. No mortal ever yet accomplished that journey without help from Heaven. If we fail in that journey, we lose all. One thing we need, that Jesus should lead us on. No other issue of life is as important as that divine guidance, and yet mortals live a lifetime, and never give it a thought; and thus:

“To-morrow, and to-morrow, and to-morrow
Creeps in this petty pace from day to day,
To the last syllable of recorded time,
And all our yesterdays have lighted fools
The way to dusty death.”

When Jesus has led the man out of the village, he halts, and taking some of the saliva of his mouth, he places it upon the blind man's eyes; then he places his hands on him and asks him if he sees aught. It is characteristic of blind men to hold the head a little downward. At Jesus' words the blind man looked up, and declared that he saw men; that is to say he saw objects that seemed as tall as trees walking. Though the sense of sight was at this point in the man's eyes, the organs were in an abnormal condition, so that the images of objects appeared greatly magnified. And Jesus again laid his sacred hands upon his eyes, and the man's eyes were perfectly restored. And Jesus sent the man away, instructing him not to go back into the village. As this is the uniform reading of the best codices we can not reject it. It seems therefore that the man did not have his domicile in the village, but that he had been brought thither to be presented to Jesus. In the light of what we have already learned of Jesus' character, it is easy to see why Jesus thus instructed the man. Jesus was seeking to avoid the notice of the public. He was aiming to prove by word and deed that he was the son of God, while shunning that human glory which he has forbidden us to seek. We can also see why Jesus used sensible signs in working this miracle. He used the same outward signs in the cure of the deaf mute, whose cure is also described by Mark. But there is one feature of this event which is not easy to explain, and that is that Jesus operated the cure by degrees. There was in the event first the stage of imperfect vision, and then by a second application of Jesus' power the man's vision was perfectly restored. This method of Jesus is new to us; thus far we have seen nothing of the kind. In fact, in most of the recorded cases the Evangelists are careful to note that the effect was immediate.

We confess our inability to determine with certainty Jesus' motive in thus varying his method of healing. It may be that this variation added to the evidential force of the miracles. If all had been wrought in exactly the same way, there would be danger that one would be confounded with another, and some of them would more easily have been forgotten. The special features of certain miracles serve to distinguish them from others of the same class; and, moreover, attach them more firmly to the minds of men. Again, by these successive stages of the event, the Apostles, who accompanied Jesus, were enabled to contemplate a certain variety in the manifestations of divine power. As we avoid sameness of style in the employment of words and expressions, so the Lord may be believed to have relieved his miraculous cures by the introduction of certain special features. And moreover, the gradual yielding of the state of blindness to the operation of divine power evinces the deep-seated malady of the man's eyes, and the reality of the divine operation.

Surely the first great motive of this miracle was to prove that Christ was the Son of God, that men might have life by faith in him. But the cure is also a type of the Lord's beneficent action on the souls of men. When a human soul is without faith it may well be said to be blind. It sees not its proper world; it sees not the end for which it was created. How we shudder in dread at the thought of being blind! By such a state we should be shut out from all the beauty of nature; shut out from the light of Heaven, from the greatest means of knowledge, and made helpless and dependent, to grope in the dark. And why are men so careless of the souls that grope forever in spiritual darkness? By corporal blindness men lose only a temporal good; but these men lose an eternal infinite good. It must be reckoned as an insult to God the way men speak of their lack of faith, as though it were an unimportant matter, an opinion not discussed because it is not entertaining. The message of Christ obtained a readier hearing in the days of the Apostles than in our day because men were not so satisfied with the present world. The men of our age are blind, but they see not their blindness. They are like the bishop of Laodicea to whom

St. John wrote: "Because thou sayest, I am rich, and have gotten riches; and have need of nothing; and thou knowest not that thou art the wretched one and miserable and poor and blind and naked: I counsel thee to buy of me gold refined by fire, that thou mayest become rich; and white garments, that thou mayest clothe thyself, and that the shame of thy nakedness be not made manifest; and eyesalve to anoint thine eyes that thou mayest see." Apoc. III. 17—18.

Our generation needs this eyesalve to see its poverty in the spiritual order. The great blindness of our race is to sacrifice an eternity in Heaven for a few years of this troubled, unhealthy existence. If on earth all men except one followed Christ, how noticeable would his folly become! And yet because the way of the largest number is to give much to the world and little or nothing to God the folly is not observed, and against the advice of St. Paul man "is fashioned according to this world." It is a fatal blindness, and although Christ is ready to heal it, unbelief keeps Christ away.

MATT. XVI. 13—20

13. Ἐλθὼν δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὰ μέρη Καισαρείας τῆς Φιλίππου, ἠρώτα τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ, λέγων: Τίνα λέγουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι εἶναι τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου;

14. Οἱ δὲ εἶπαν: Οἱ μὲν Ἰωάννην τὸν βαπτιστὴν, οἱ δέ: Ἡλίαν, ἕτεροι δέ, Ἰερεμίαν, ἢ ἕνα τῶν προφητῶν.

15. Λέγει αὐτοῖς: Ὑμεῖς δὲ τίνα μὲ λέγετε εἶναι;

16. Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ Σίμων Πέτρος, εἶπεν: Σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος.

17. Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, εἶπεν αὐτῷ: Μακάριος εἶ, Σίμων βαριωνά, ὅτι σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα οὐκ ἀπεκάλυψέν σοι, ἀλλ' ὁ Πατὴρ μου ὁ ἐν οὐρανοῖς.

MARK VIII. 27—30

27. Καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰς κώμας Καισαρείας τῆς Φιλίππου, καὶ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ἐπηρώτα τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ, λέγων αὐτοῖς: Τίνα μὲ λέγουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι εἶναι;

28. Οἱ δὲ εἶπαν αὐτῷ λέγοντες: Ὅτι Ἰωάννην τὸν βαπτιστὴν, καὶ ἄλλοι Ἡλίαν, ἄλλοι δέ, ὅτι εἷς τῶν προφητῶν.

29. Καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπηρώτα αὐτούς: Ὑμεῖς δὲ τίνα μὲ λέγετε εἶναι; Ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Πέτρος, λέγει αὐτῷ: Σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστός.

18. Κάγώ δέ σοι λέγω, ὅτι σὺ εἶ Πέτρος, καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ οἰκοδομήσω μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ πύλαι ᾧδου οὐ κατισχύσουσιν αὐτῆς.

19. Καὶ δώσω σοι τὰς κλεῖδας τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν, καὶ ὃ ἂν δήσῃς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ἔσται δεδεμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, καὶ ὃ ἂν λύσῃς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ἔσται λελυμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

20. Τότε ἐπέτιμήσεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς, ἵνα μηδενὶ εἴπωσιν, ὅτι αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ Χριστός.

13. Now when Jesus came into the parts of Cæsarea Philippi, he asked his disciples, saying: Who do men say that the Son of man is?

14. And they said: Some say John the Baptist: some: Eliah: and others: Jeremiah, or one of the prophets.

15. He saith unto them: But who say ye that I am?

16. And Simon Peter answered and said: Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.

17. And Jesus answered and said unto him: Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father who is in Heaven.

18. And I also say unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church: and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it.

19. I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of Heaven

30. Καὶ ἐπέτιμήσεν αὐτοῖς ἵνα μηδενὶ λέγωσιν περὶ αὐτοῦ.

27. And Jesus went forth, and his disciples, into the villages of Cæsarea Philippi: and in the way he asked his disciples, saying unto them: Who do men say that I am?

28. And they told him, saying: John the Baptist: and others, Eliah; but others: One of the prophets.

29. And he asked them: But who say ye that I am? Peter answereth and saith unto him: Thou art the Christ.

and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in Heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in Heaven.

20. Then charged he the disciples that they should tell no man that he was the Christ.

30. And he charged them that they should tell no man of him.

LUKE IX. 18-21

18. And it came to pass, as he was praying alone, the disciples were with him: and he asked them, saying: Who do the multitudes say that I am?

19. And they answering said: John the Baptist; but others say: Eliah; and others, that one of the old prophets is risen again.

20. And he said unto them: But who say ye that I am? And Peter answering said: The Christ of God.

21. But he charged them, and commanded them to tell this to no man.

18. Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ εἶναι αὐτὸν προσευχόμενον κατὰ μόνας, συνῆσαν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταί, καὶ ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτούς, λέγων: Τίνα με οἱ ὄχλοι λέγουσιν εἶναι;

19. Οἱ δὲ ἀποκριθέντες εἶπαν: Ἰωάννην τὸν βαπτιστὴν, ἄλλοι δὲ, Ἡλίαν, ἄλλοι δὲ, ὅτι προφῆτης τις τῶν ἀρχαίων ἀνέστη.

20. Εἶπεν δὲ αὐτοῖς: Ὑμεῖς δὲ τίνα με λέγετε εἶναι; Πέτρος δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν: Τὸν Χριστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ.

21. Ὁ δὲ ἐπιτιμήσας αὐτοῖς, παρήγγειλεν μηδεὶν λέγειν τοῦτο.

In Verse twenty of Matthew B*, D, et al. have *ἐπετίμησεν* instead of *διεστείλατο*. This reading is approved by Westcott and Hort. In the same verse some authorities add *Ἰησοῦς*.

In Verse twenty-eight, **℣**, B, C*, L, the Coptic version, Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort endorse the reading *ὅτι εἰς*: other authorities have *ἓνα*. D has *ὡς ἓνα*. In Verse twenty-nine **℣**, L, the Peshitto and Jerusalem Syriac add *ὁ Τίς τοῦ Θεοῦ*.

We notice here that Luke after a long silence again takes up the narrative of events. We marvel not so much at the silence of John. He is not a synoptist; and his Gospel presupposed the existence of the synoptic Gospels, and was

written to develop more thoroughly certain themes, especially the consubstantial, co-equal Divinity of Jesus.

But Luke professes in his proem to essay an accurate historical treatment of the Gospel narrative, and this present lacuna ill comports with his design. He passes from the first multiplication of bread to the confession of Peter at Cæsarea-Philippi, omitting Jesus' walking upon the sea, the discourse on the Eucharist at Capharnaum, the dispute with the Pharisees concerning the washing of hands, the journey into the borders of Tyre and Sidon and the cure of the daughter of the Syrophœnician woman, the journey through Decapolis back to the Lake of Gennesaret, the miraculous healings near the shore of the lake, and especially the cure of the deaf mute mentioned by Mark, the second multiplication of bread, the Pharisees' demand for a sign, and the cure of the blind man.

Now in seeking the cause of this lacuna, men arrive at widely divergent conclusions. And it is not profitable to review much that has been written thereon. It seems that the fact is explainable by the following considerations. Every Evangelist omitted many things which Jesus said and did. Also a certain independence and individuality characterize every one. Therefore it is inevitable that one Evangelist should omit data that the others record, and record data that the others omit. Luke was not an actor in the events of the Gospel; therefore that vivid impression, that comes to the mind from beholding, was not in him. He wrote to increase the clearness of the records of the New Testament, and he certainly was aware of the existence of the other two Gospels. Aside from the Eucharistic discourse, a knowledge of the events here omitted by St. Luke is not essential to the right understanding of the message of Christ. The synoptists evidently considered the discourse at Capharnaum fully comprehended in the clearer discourse at the Last Supper. The doctrinal import of the second multiplication of bread is included in the first multiplication, and the records of cures and disputes with the Pharisees were evidently by Luke considered covered by other portions of his Gospel. Hence we believe that Luke, who evidently studies order and brevity

in his account, intentionally omitted these data as not essential to his scope. Matthew wrote them, because his personal observation of the events had fixed in his mind a deep impression; and Mark wrote them, because he was Peter's scribe.

A thing more difficult to explain is the omission by both Mark and Luke of the great promise made here by Jesus to Peter, by which Peter is appointed the rock upon which the Church was to be built. A possible explanation of Mark's omission is found in the fact that he received his data from Peter, and Peter through Christian humility was unwilling to communicate anything so honorable to himself.

It is more difficult to find an explanation of Luke's omission. The far-reaching consequences of the words they recorded were not fully comprehended by the Evangelists. They comprehended enough of the message to have a saving faith, and to preach a saving faith to the men of their day. But the great growth of the organization and the grand development of doctrine were not fully understood by them. They thus often are unconscious instruments to record things whose full import they did not understand. Moreover, they never write under the persuasion that they are drafting the constitution of the Church. They write of the Church not as of a thing that should come into being out of their writings, but as of a thing already existing, and vastly more comprehensive than their records. Every writer of the New Testament gives evidence in his work that he is but writing a partial description of some of the chief events in the origin of the Church.

The truths that formed the immediate life of the Church are recorded by all. But in the infant age of the Church, its perfect social organization was not so prominent in the thoughts of men. Peter remained what he had been before Jesus' death, the chief of the Apostles. His word was authoritative, but that there was represented in him a supreme president of a world-organization with center in Rome was not clearly understood by the men who wrote the New Testament. The Providence of God so worked in the formation of the New Testament that we have a record of these words, and that is sufficient.

Cæsarea-Philippi was formerly called Paneas or Panias. This name came from that fact that the city was consecrated to the god Pan, who had a celebrated temple there. The site of the ancient city is now called Banias. It is situated in Gaulonitis at the foot of the southern slope of Mt. Hermon. It is almost directly east of the ancient city of Tyre, and slightly east of north of Capharnaum. The distance from Capharnaum to Cæsarea-Philippi is about twenty-three miles. The city of Cæsarea-Philippi was built out of the ancient Paneas by Philip the Tetrarch. He called it Cæsarea in honor of Tiberius Cæsar, and Philip's name was added to the name of the city to distinguish it from Cæsarea Sebaste built by Herod the Great.

Jesus and his band of Apostles have now separated themselves for a time from the multitudes of Galilee. They have come into the cool picturesque country abounding in springs and caves in the environs of Cæsarea-Philippi. There is no evidence that they entered the city. Here they can rest awhile. Jesus withdraws himself from his Apostles for a time to pray alone. When his prayer is concluded, he again unites himself with his Apostles, and asks them: "Who do men say that the Son of man is?" And the Apostles answered: "Some say: John the Baptist; some: Eliah; and others: Jeremiah, or one of the prophets."

When Herod Antipas sought to know who Jesus was, the same answer was returned to his questions.

The Lord often speaks of himself as the Son of man. Such name had been given him by Daniel, the prophet. The Lord's frequent use of this phrase is to prove the reality of his humanity. It would be easier to believe that God had appeared in the mere semblance of a human body, than that the Son of God had become a real man. Hence to render incontestable the truth of the reality of the assumption of our human nature. Jesus frequently proclaims his human sonship.

The character of Jesus and his miracles left no doubt in the popular mind that he was a man of God. The fame of John had been great in Israel, and the similarity between his teaching and that of Jesus impelled many to believe that Jesus was none other than John who had risen from the dead. Others, moved by the prophecy that Eliah should come before

the day of the Messiah, believed that Eliah had come in the person of Jesus. Others believed that Jesus was Jeremiah or some other one of the prophets.

The reason that the people thought of Jeremiah was most probably the vision of Oniah recorded in the II. Book of Maccabees XV. 14: "After this there appeared also another man, admirable for age, and glory, and environed with great beauty and majesty. Then Oniah answering said: This is a lover of his brethern, and of the people of Israel: this is he that prayeth much for the people, and for all the holy city, Jeremiah, the prophet of God. Whereupon Jeremiah stretched forth his right hand, and gave to Judas a sword of gold, saying: Take this holy sword, a gift from God, wherewith thou shalt overthrow the adversaries of my people, Israel."

It may seem strange at first sight, after all the evidence that had been given to Israel, that no considerable part of the people had believed in the Messiahship of Jesus. His proofs had made it impossible to deny that he was an authentic legate of God, but they would not admit that he was the Messiah. National pride and the vain expectation that the Messiah should restore Israel to great political power and glory so pre-occupied the Jewish mind that they would not see the Messiah in the poor man of Nazareth. It was the everlasting conflict between worldliness and the spiritual; and the result was the same as it has ever been: the world held the multitudes, and the spiritual order of things obtained only a few chosen followers.

We observe that the Lord does not proceed immediately to a direct question concerning the Apostles' faith in him: he first asks what was the opinion of the people, and then he asks what the Apostles believe concerning him. The first question was a graceful introduction to the second; it furnished an occasion to transmit to us the state of religious thought of the Jewish people, and it illustrated the act of faith of the Apostles in its proper light by contrasting it with the popular opinions.

Moreover the opinion of the people was an evidence of Christ's Divinity. The evidence had been such in Jesus' life that the whole people acknowledged that he was an authentic

legate of God. Jesus catered to no popular taste, he flattered no popular pride. He taught a doctrine that was hard for a Jew to accept; he was opposed by the strong sect of the Pharisees, and by the other sects of the Jews; and yet the people were moved to persuasion that he was a prophet. Now Jesus shaped his whole life to the proving of the truth that he was the Son of God, and that redemption should come through him as the Son of God. Therefore Christ was either the Son of God or an impostor. But the power of God would not co-operate in confirming the claims of an impostor. The people of Israel bore witness that the power of God is with Jesus, and hence Jesus' claim must have been true.

When Jesus asks the Apostles for a direct expression of their belief concerning him, Peter answers: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God."

Two truths are contained in the confession of Peter. First, he declares that Jesus is the Messiah expected of Israel, and, secondly, he declares that such Messiah is the Son of God. Jewish thought did not hold that the Messiah should be the co-equal Son of God.

The confession of Peter is clear and full. The fact that Jesus accepts the confession makes it absolutely infallible. In fact, since Christ declares that it came through the revelation of his Heavenly Father, it is as though it were uttered by the Father.

Hence it is a grand proof of the divine character of Christ. In accepting it, Christ declares that flesh and blood had not revealed it unto Peter, but God the Father had revealed it unto him. By this Christ affirms that the act of faith of which this sentence was the expression was absolutely true, that this act of faith was not a mere human thought, having no foundation but the fallible act of a human mind, but that God's action in the soul of Peter illumined the soul of the man infallibly to see and to grasp the truth which he there proclaims.

It is evident that "flesh and blood" as here employed mean human nature according to its mere natural powers, without supernatural illumination.

The confession of Peter has been a truth that has been contradicted. Many heretics, recognizing that by logical

necessity they must admit that the Pope of Rome is to the Church what Peter was to the first apostolic body, endeavor to limit Peter's place and authority in that body. Hence they assert that Peter spoke here as a delegated representative of all the Apostles; and therefore they claim that the words of Christ, though spoken to the representative, apply to the whole body, and establish no pre-eminence of Peter over the other Apostles. Were it not for the heavy consequences that have resulted from this error, we might dismiss it as an inane creation of the abuse of man's reason; but many have been led thereby to "forsake the fountains of living waters, and to hew out for themselves cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water."

As in the days of the Lord, the fierce hatred against him so obscured the mind of the Jewish people that they would hold to every absurdity rather than accept Christ, so in the days following the great apostasy, hatred of Rome moves men to accept many foolish opinions rather than admit Rome's God-given primacy and authority.

However we must admit that some writers in denying this vain theory of the heretics have denied too much. We are willing to admit that Peter did speak there in a certain representative capacity, but we believe that it was not as a delegate speaking merely in the name and by the authority of the others, but as the recognized leader of the Apostles to whom they looked for guidance and inspiration.

The plain words of the text prove with great clearness that it was not the delegation of the Apostles, but the inspiration of God the Father that moved Peter to the sublime confession of Christ's Divinity. Peter's faith was more advanced than that of the other Apostles. Their faith was in a formative state; it had not yet crystallized into that perfect form which it afterwards assumed. God was pleased to help them to full faith, and in the present instance he did it by inspiring their leader to utter the grand central formula of all faith.

God the Father used Peter here to confirm the faith of his brother Apostles, just as Christ afterwards declared that he being converted should confirm his brothers. Peter received his inspiration from God, and the other Apostles received their inspiration from Peter.

It was not then for the first time that Peter had confessed this truth. In the synagogue of Capharnaum, after the promulgation of the doctrine of the Real Presence in the Eucharist, when many disciples abandoned the following of Jesus Christ, Peter in the name of the whole apostolic body made profession of faith: "And we have believed and know that thou art the Holy One of God."—John VI. 69.

It must have been that the Apostles had often conferred together concerning this truth. The truth was announced by John the Baptist and attested by the voice of God from Heaven, and by the visible descent of the Holy Ghost. It received proof from the miracles of Jesus. But still the truth was so grand and mysterious that it required time to fix itself upon the minds of the Apostles. In all the events recorded we find that the master mind among the Apostles is Peter. His utterances are the index of the Apostles' thoughts, not because he is their delegated representative, but because he is their leader, to whom they look for guidance in formulating their opinions. We believe therefore, that it is a vain contention to hold that Peter here is not pre-eminent over the other Apostles in his confession of Jesus' Divinity, and consequently in his apostolic office.

The next point to consider is Jesus' declaration concerning Peter.

In the first place Peter is called blessed in the knowledge of Christ's Divinity revealed to him by God. Blessed is here used in the sense of favored, happy, fortunate. The greatest of all blessings is the saving knowledge of Jesus Christ. "And this is life eternal, that they should know thee, the only true God, and him whom thou didst send, Jesus Christ."—John, XVII. 3. No matter what cogitations may be in the mind of man, if he have not the knowledge of Jesus Christ, his mind is a dead and dreary waste.

There is a beautiful correspondence between the declaration of Peter and the declaration of Jesus. Peter by divine inspiration declares what Jesus is; and Jesus in turn by his own divine authority declares what Peter is.

In our First Volume, page 372, we explained the sense of the surname Peter. It is evident that the "Bar-Jona"

of the present text is the same as "son of John," as Simon is called in John, I. 42, and XXI. 16. Bar-Jona is the Aramaic form of בן-יוחנן. Another proof of this is the passage from II. Kings, [Vulg. IV. Kings] XXV. 23, wherein the יוחנן of the original is rendered 'Ιωνά by the Septuagint.

As we have before explained the term Peter, *πέτρος*, is an attempt to reproduce the original **פֶּטְרָא** used by the Lord. The signification of this term is a firm, immovable rock. The declaration of Jesus really should be rendered: "And I also say unto thee that thou art a rock, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it."

Much of the force of the declaration of Christ is lost by the employment of two terms *πέτρος* and *πέτρα* to represent the original Aramaic term כִּיפָא. It is evident that the Lord employed but one term, and that there is an absolute identity between the term used as the surname of Simon and the term used for the foundation of the Church. The writer of the Greek simply gave to the term, when used as a surname of Simon, a masculine ending for the sake of the grace of language, since both terms mean a rock.

The Syriac version employs the same term for the surname of Simon and for the foundation of the Church:

يُؤَيِّدُكُمْ وَيُخْرِجُكُمْ مِنْ ظِلِّهِ إِلَى نَارٍ مُنِيرَةٍ

The Ethiopian also uses the same term in both positions:

ለኛተ፡ሹዝታ፡ጠይቤዚ፡ሹዝታ

Wherefore it is evident that all interpretations must be abandoned that are founded upon the difference between *πίτρος* and *πέτρα*. The Lord employed the one term in both positions, and the exact Greek equivalent of this term is *πέτρα*.

The exact signification of the Greek *πέτρα* corresponds to the Latin *rupes*, a rock, crag, or ledge of rock undetached

from the bedrock of the earth. Πέτρος corresponds to Latin *saxum*, a detached piece of rock, a stone. The Lord gives to Peter a surname which likens the character which Peter bears in his office in the Church, to the rock which men select for the foundation of great buildings, and then Christ declares that upon that rock he will build his Church.

Coming back therefore to the full force of the original, we find that Jesus said unto Simon: "Thou art a rock, and upon this rock I will build my Church."

Christ here explains the reason of Simon's surname. This is God's way in placing upon men certain names. Abraham was thus called, because he was to be the father of a multitude of nations. Sarah was thus called, because she was to be the mother of these nations. John the Baptist was called John, because he was to be the herald of the reign of *grace*. The Saviour was called Jesus by God's angel, because he was to save the people. And Simon was called "the rock," because he was to be the foundation on which the Church of Christ should be built. Therefore it is clear that the same entity is signified by "rock" as the surname of Simon, and by "rock" as the foundation of the Church. There is no plainer figure in all literature; and yet through desperate hate of the primacy of Rome, protestants have endeavored to distort this clear statement of Christ into a meaning which would agree with their prejudices.

Some protestants attempt to enfeeble the proof of Peter's primacy by claiming that by the word "rock," when used as the foundation of the Church, Christ meant himself, and that Christ by some gesture pointed to himself in uttering this member of the sentence.

Certainly the gesture is a gratuitous assertion; and any cause that is reduced to such a flimsy pretence as this is unworthy of serious consideration. Such an interpretation would make the sentence of Christ meaningless and stupid. It is an insult to Christ to say that he would so employ language. What sense is there in a solemn manner to say that Simon was a rock, and then, in the same sentence to say that Christ would build his Church upon some other rock? What sense would there be in the declaration that Christ would

build his Church upon himself, in a context wherein he was rewarding Peter's confession of faith by declaring what Peter was? Why was it prophesied by Jesus that Simon should be called a rock? and why is the prophecy here fulfilled if he is not the rock upon which the Church is founded? Unless we concede that in surnaming Simon the rock, Jesus designated him as the rock foundation of the Church, the solemn declaration of Jesus becomes a barren empty jugglery of words. And we know that Jesus used no words without meaning.

In fact, this truth is so clear that the more enlightened protestant expositors grant Simon's primacy, but they deny that his primacy passed to his successors. We shall deal with this point in the course of our present exposition.

We next take up to examine what sense Christ intended to convey by declaring: "Upon this rock I will build my Church." The figure represents the Church under the figure of an edifice of which Christ is the builder, and Peter the foundation-stone. The surname of Simon indicates solidity, the solidity of the bed rock, and hence the sentence conveys the meaning that Christ is building a firm building that shall stand against all opposing causes.

Christ declares that Peter is to be to the Church what the foundation rock is to a building; and the house built on a rock shall stand in the face of the wind and rain.

The term *ecclesia* corresponds to the Hebrew קְהָל which signified the congregation of the chosen people assembled for worship in the temple. It also signified the entire Jewish people, inasmuch as they were united in one theocratic covenant. Thus Israel is called the *assembly* or *church* of the Lord in Numbers XVI. 3; XX. 4; in Deut., XXIII. 2, 3, 8; in I. Chron. XXVIII. 8; and in Micah, II. 5. Therefore the Lord employed the same term to denote the worldwide congregation of the New Testament. He employs the term in an absolutely universal sense to include all the faithful of mankind.

In calling the universality of the faithful a *church*, and comparing them to a building, Christ evidently declares that the Church shall be a visible organization. The building of

it upon Peter indicates that this organization shall have a supreme president, and a supreme center of authority, and that the cohesive principle that shall bind the organization together, and give to it stability and perpetuity shall be Christ's power working through the organization. Now no proper organization of men can be without a supreme president, and a central authority; and Christ in this very declaration provided for the perpetual existence of such central authority, and appointed Peter the first supreme president.

It is evident also that Christ is not merely forming the organization of the Church for the few years of Peter's life. The relation of a foundation to a house is not a transient relation, but a permanent one; the foundation must last as long as the house lasts.

Hence it is plain that they err greatly who believe that Peter was the foundation of the Church inasmuch as he was the first to preach the Gospel to the Jews and then to the Gentiles after the descent of the Holy Ghost. [Acts II. 14; X. 15, 48.] This opinion is intrinsically absurd. That Peter should take the initiative in both these events comports with his office as head of the Church; but that Peter's selection in such a solemn manner by Christ as the foundation-rock of the organization of the Church means no more than this, is not credible. As we have said before, the foundation of a building remains as long as the building remains; but the preaching of Peter was a transient thing. There is no similarity between these acts of Peter and the foundation of a building. A foundation of a building gives it its stability; and the foundation of a moral organization must be a center of authority which shall preserve the organization in existence, and unify it by a system of constitutional laws.

It would be absurd to declare a man the rock on which a moral body is built from any other cause than that he preserves a permanent authoritative relation to the very organization itself. It would be absurd to create an organization of men without a supreme head. Now from the fact that Christ wished to deal with the world through an organization, it was to be expected that he should give it the elements without which it could not exist. He has done so in clearest terms

in appointing Peter as the supreme president, and in defining his powers. And yet men refuse to believe the plain sense of Christ's words; and the cause is hatred of Rome. This hatred was predicted by Christ, and we are not surprised thereat.

More absurd still is the opinion which holds that the Church was not built upon Peter, but upon Peter's act of faith expressed in his confession of Christ's Divinity. In dealing with this theory, we are ready to concede that the faith of Peter was the motive cause which moved Christ to select him for his high office. It is true that Peter's confession of faith indicated the function of the head of Christ's organization, which should be to teach infallibly the faith of Christ, and hold all the members in a unity of faith. But it is false that Christ primarily signified by the rock on which the church is built Peter's confession of faith. They say that Peter's confession was the formula of all right faith in the Divinity of Christ, and that Christianity is built upon this right faith. This is true, but this does not conflict with the institution of a supreme head of an organization whose organic unity is based upon a unity of doctrine, a unity of regimen, and a unity of sacraments.

In the first place the opinion which makes the rock of the Church not Peter's person, but his subjective act of faith, can not be derived from the plain words of Christ without doing violence to them. Peter had declared what the person of Jesus was, and Jesus declares what the person of Peter was to be. Not without violence can we construe the declaration of Christ to mean that the rock of the Church was Peter's act of faith. If Jesus had meant this sense, he would doubtless have said; "Thou art a rock of faith, and upon this faith I will build my Church."

But, moreover, the use of language is evidence against the aforesaid opinion. A visible organization demands to be built upon a visible foundation. In other words, the abstract principles which form the soul of an organization demand to be represented by some concrete center of authority which shall enforce these principles, and execute the laws necessary for the preservation of the organization. Now faith, as an abstract virtue, can be considered as the foundation of the spiritual life;

but it would be incongruous to make it the foundation-rock of a visible organization in the context in which Christ used it. Of course, faith is the foundation of the Church, and the foundation of all supernatural life, but Peter's central authority is the instrument by which God preserves in the Christian organization the unity of faith.

Certain it is that when Christ said: "Thou art a rock," he meant the person of Peter, and not his confession of faith. Now since Christ uses in the next member the very same term which is the surname of Simon, he can not be thought to have changed the sense of the term, for thus no man could understand him.

A difficulty is brought against our exposition from the fact that Christ is the foundation on which the Church is built, and according to Paul: "Other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ."—I. Cor. III. 11. This objection is easily answered. Paul is speaking there of faith in the Divinity of Jesus Christ as the foundation of religion. Peter is not the foundation of the Church in the sense that belief in Peter will save the world. The principal head of the Church, the principal foundation of the Church is Jesus Christ; and for that cause he calls the Church that he built on Peter *my* Church. But Peter is the vicarious foundation. Peter is the foundation, because in the social organization he represents the supreme invisible head Jesus Christ. In a similar way, Jesus Christ was the essential light of the world; and yet he himself calls his legates the light of the world. They were vicarious lights, inasmuch as they represented Jesus Christ, and acted in his power and authority. In every human society there must be authority, and that authority must be represented by some concrete exponent. All the authority which operates in the Church is, of course, vested in Christ as its essential source, but Peter represents Christ as a human exponent of this authority.

Another objection is founded upon the words of St. Paul to the Ephesians, II. 19-20: "So then ye are no more strangers and sojourners, but ye are fellow citizens with the saints, and all of the household of God, being built upon the founda-

tion of the Apostles, and Prophets, Christ Jesus himself being the chief corner stone."

The evident meaning of this passage is that the foundations of belief in Christ the author of the New Testament are the Messianic prophecies of the Old Law and the message delivered by the Apostles. The Judæo-Christians in the first ages scrutinized the Scriptures closely to find the agreement between the events of Christ's life and the prophecies. The preaching of the Apostles corroborated by the prophecies constituted the basis of faith. Paul does not exclude the Law of Moses, but the prophets here are mentioned especially since they were the counterpart of the prophets in the Old Law. The function of the prophets in the Old Law was to expound and apply the Mosaic Covenant to the people of Israel.

Now we do not deny that the message delivered by the Apostles and corroborated by the prophecies was a foundation of belief. But we deny that Christ, in addressing Simon Peter as "the rock," had reference only to his personal preaching as one of the Apostles. The context of Paul's Epistle clearly demands that we interpret the passage of the preaching of the Apostles as a foundation of belief. The constitution in a metaphorical sense of an entity as a foundation does not exclude another foundation, where the idea is somewhat different. The teaching of the Apostles was the foundation of belief in the sense of the communication of the truth; Peter is the foundation of the Church in the sense that he is the central authority in an organization that must have authority. As such, his teaching is not excluded; it is the formal element in his primacy: he is made the chief of all teachers, with power to exact from men the obedience of faith. The words of Christ in appointing Peter "the rock" of the foundation of the Church are far more solemn than the words of Paul regarding the apostolic body. Peter is singled out and surnamed in the most solemn manner. He receives a name of more symbolic import than the name of Abraham. He is declared not in a general way a foundation of the Church, but "the rock" upon which Christ shall build the Church. Now such a surnaming and such an address would be absurd, if it imported nothing more than that Peter should be associated with the other Apostles in preaching the Gospel of Christ.

An objection is sometimes sought in the writings of the Fathers against the Catholic interpretation of the present passage. We find occasional instances where the Fathers explain the term rock, as here used, of Christ himself, and others refer it to faith in Christ. Natalis Alexander has ably stated the case: "There are two Catholic interpretations of the words: 'upon this rock.' One interpretation refers the words to the faith of Peter; the other refers them to the person of Peter. But there is this difference between these interpretations, the latter is direct, the former derived; the latter is old and constant, the former is new and adventitious; the latter reigned alone in the Church for four centuries, the former arose out of a special emergency. Before the rise of the Arian heresy the sole received exposition referred the words to the person of Peter, as is evident from Origen, Tertullian, and Cyprian. But when the Arians openly attacked the Divinity of Christ, the Fathers recognizing the great bulwark of Catholic faith in those words of St. Peter: "Thou art Christ the Son of the living God," greatly extolled the confession of Peter. Wherefore since, through this confession, Peter merited to be constituted the foundation of the Church, the Fathers by metonymy called the confession itself the foundation of the Church, passing from the cause to the effect, that they might make head against the Arians, who strove to destroy the foundation of the Church."—Hist. Eccles., Tom. III. p. 99. Hence we never find Fathers denying that Peter is the rock of the foundation of the Church; but having accepted this, we sometimes find them adopting derived meanings which do not exclude the basic sense of the words. It would make our treatise too extended if we reproduced any great amount of patristic data on this theme. We shall limit ourselves to some representative statements. Hilary apostrophizes Peter: "O thou foundation of the Church, blessed in thy surname!"—In Math. XVI.

St. Ambrose declares: "When Christ called Simon the rock, he clearly indicated that he was the foundation of the Church."—Lib. IV. de Fide, Cap. 3.

Augustine is a firm defender of the primacy, although at times his peculiar intellectual bent led him into some vagaries.

In his twenty-ninth sermon on the saints, he discourses thus: "[Simon] alone among the Apostles merited to hear: 'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church.' He was indeed worthy to be to the nations who should be formed into the Church of God, the rock of foundation, the column of support, and the key of authority." Speaking of St. Cyprian, St. Augustine says: "Behold, where Cyprian cites what we have learned from the Holy Scriptures, that the Apostle Peter, in whom the primacy of the Apostles is vested, was rebuked by his inferior Apostle Paul."—Lib. II. de Bapt. 1.

But in his book of retracts, I. 21, Augustine has a curious opinion: "I have said in a certain place concerning the Apostle Peter that on him, as on a rock, the Church is founded; which sense is chanted by many in the verses of St. Ambrose, where Ambrose speaks thus of the cock: 'At his song the rock of the Church bewails his fault.' But I know that I have afterwards very often expounded the words: 'Thou art Peter,' etc, in the sense that the rock signified him whom Peter confessed, and thus Peter would be denominated from his relation to that rock [Christ], and would represent the person of the Church which is built upon that rock, and which has received the keys of the kingdom of Heaven. For it was not said to him: "Thou art *petra*; but thou art Petrus. The *petra* was Christ whom Simon confessed. . . . Let the reader choose which is the more probable of these two interpretations." It is evident that the whole argumentation, which is peculiarly Augustinian, is founded on a misconception arising from Augustine's ignorance of the Oriental tongues. It is conceded by all that Christ used the same term as the surname of Peter and as the foundation of the Church, hence Augustine's second theory is untenable. Epiphanius declares: "The Lord established Simon the first of the Apostles, the firm rock on which the Church is built."—Anchoratus, I. Jerome in his book against Jovinian declares that Peter "one of the twelve was chosen as the head, that the danger of schism might be averted."

This is the general trend of patristic teaching. No Father ever denied the primacy, and whatever secondary and derived meanings they may have adopted, they always held fast to the

principal one, that Peter was the rock of the Church's foundation.

Another proof of the Catholic interpretation of these words of Christ is the fact that we find in existence through the ages from the beginning an institution corresponding in every part to the promise made by Christ to Peter. No pretension of man could have upheld that institution in the face of the opposition that it has encountered. In the fierce upheavals which have shaken the world, all the old institutions have been changed and superseded by new things; but the power of Peter has not felt the shadow of change or decay; nay more, it has developed by vital growth into the use and exercise of a larger authority.

The strongest motives that sway the minds of men have been employed by the world to draw men away from obedience to the successors of St. Peter. In abandoning Rome men had everything worldly to gain, and nothing worldly to lose; their patriotism was appealed to; place and preferment were offered them in the state; and social station and honors were offered in their social life, and all to no avail. The indefectibility promised by Christ to his Church is enjoyed by the visible head of that Church, and the see of Peter can not fail.

When once it is conceded that Christ appointed Peter the supreme president of the organized Church, it is not difficult to deduce therefrom a perpetual line of successors having the same relation to the organization as the first supreme head. Christ was not founding a mere temporary organization, but an organization that should last till the end of time. He promised her perpetuity, and success from the very fact that she is built on a rock. For the statement of Christ is equivalent to this: "Thou art a rock, and upon this rock I will build my Church; and therefore, because it is built upon a rock, the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it." Now we do not believe that any man of honest sane judgment will assert that Christ was there only speaking of that age of the Church during which St. Peter was present on earth in the flesh. It is equally repugnant to sound sense to believe that Christ characterized as the gates of Hades only those causes which opposed the Church during the lifetime of Peter. Christ founded a Church

that should exist for all ages and teach all nations. The essentials that it needed in the beginning it needed throughout its life. Its foundation is an essential. The only way then logically to construe Christ's words is to understand that Peter as the foundation of the Church never dies. It was not the mere flesh and blood of Peter that was the foundation of the Church, but the authority of Christ represented in him, and this never dies. The individuals die, but the institution can not die, and a moral continuity is always maintained, so that the same foundation always remains. And the pages of history attest this fact. The existence of the unbroken line of the bishops of Rome, and their power in the world are unexplainable facts in the world's history, unless we admit that God willed it so, and that the present words of Christ are a manifestation of that will.

We next proceed to develop the sense of the clause: "And the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it."

The term "Ἅδης" is employed by profane writers to signify the state of souls after death. The Septuagint uniformly renders by this term the Hebrew שְׁאוֹל, which signifies in general the place of the dead. It was represented in the Old Testament as a dark subterranean land inhabited by the souls of the dead. Its gates are spoken of by Isaiah: "I said in the noontide of my days, I shall go into the gates of Sheol."—Is. XXXVIII. 10. Thus in the Old Testament it was a vague idea to designate the state of the dead. It included the grave, but united with it that unknown state of being in which the dead remain until the resurrection.

In the New Testament the term Hades which is the equivalent of Sheol is frequently used to signify the state after death of the wicked. It also signifies Satan's realm. Thus it is used in Apocalypse XX. 14: "And death and Hades were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death, the lake of fire." This is clearly the sense in which Christ employs the term here. Satan and all those agencies which work with him and are controlled by him shall wage war upon the Church, but they shall not prevail.

By a metaphor usual in Eastern languages the power of this city is spoken of as its gates. Throughout the nations of

the East it was in the gates of the villages and cities that all cases were tried, and justice administered; hence figuratively the power and authority of the cities were called its gates. So well known is this in all Oriental literature that it is unnecessary to adduce citations to prove it. It is evident therefore that Christ by this figure asserts that all the power of Satan and of his servants shall not prevail against the organized Church of Christ. We believe also that in the expression "the gates of Hades" there is included also forces of this world; it includes every force that makes for Satan.

It is evident that the entity, against which the power of Satan's kingdom shall not prevail, is the Church, and for the reason that it is built upon a rock. It is the idea therefore of Christ that the stability of the Church comes from the nature of its foundation, and that this foundation is such that the Church can not fail.

Of course, the Church is not built on a human foundation; the Church is built on the infinite power of Christ. But Christ has chosen to be represented in the Church by a center of authority, and hence this authority is upheld by Christ himself. Now that central authority is Peter and his successors.

The instrumental agent through which the power of God gives stability to the Church is the visible head of the Church which was first constituted in St. Peter and has been perpetuated through his successors, and shall be until the end of time. In this sense St. Thomas declares that *secundum se* Christ is the foundation of the Church; and that Peter is the foundation as the vicar of Christ. And he declares that *on account of its foundation* the Catholic Church was not destroyed.

It is evident that Christ in that one sentence declared the infallibility and the indestructibility of the Church, and assigned the cause thereof. Such effects should follow because of the foundation on which Christ built that Church. In similar sense St. Leo the Great declares: "Having assumed Peter into a sharing of individual unity with himself [the Lord] declared what Peter was by affirming: 'Thou art Peter' etc., that the edifice of the eternal temple might by the marvelous gift of the grace of God rest on the firm foundation of Peter, so strengthening the Church by his firmness that neither

human malice nor the gates of hell can prevail against it." [Epist. X. 1] It is not what Peter is in himself that gives strength to the Church, but it is what Peter became under the action of the grace of God. The Lord willed to give everlasting endurance and infallibility to the Church by means of a vicarious instrument of power. Peter's confession of faith illustrated what he and his successors should do for the Church of Christ. They should profess the true faith and promulgate it to all mankind, and this faith should be the principle of the Church's undying life.

Christ considered both the head of the Apostles and the Apostles as beings that were to last till the end of time. In a subsequent passage, addressing the Apostles, he declared to them that he would be with them till the end of time. He commissioned them to teach all nations. The end of time is not come. England, Germany, America, Japan and many other lands were never reached by the original Apostles. The only way then to explain Christ's words is to recognize in them the foundation of an institution which should never die. So Peter represented an institution that should never die. And the power of Christ acting through this institution gives to it a power to overcome every adverse agency, and to live forever.

It is implied in the words of Christ that a terrible conflict shall be waged against the Church of Christ. Christ did not say that the gates of Hades should not harass and persecute the Church. But it is promised that the power of Satan shall not prevail. This is our firm hope in trial and adversity. This is our trust when we see coalitions of powerful agencies combined against the Church. She can not fail either from within or from without. She can not prove false to her trust and teach men a lie instead of the truth; she can not fail to teach men the truth; she can not be overthrown by all the power which Satan can bring against her.

The great error of the apostates of the sixteenth century was the assertion that the Church of Christ had failed through the corruption of her head and members. It is true that the corruption was there; Christ never promised that it should not invade his organization: he predicted that scandals should come; corruption invaded the original band of the twelve

Apostles. But this corruption did not destroy the Church of Christ, nor neutralize its mission. This corruption wrought great havoc among the Church's members; but still the institution of Christ changed not, but like a vigorous body threw off the diseased parts, and again returned to healthy life. If we believe the words of Christ; if we grant that from the Apostolic age there existed an organization to which Christ's promises had been made; then the so-called Reformation is no longer justifiable. Reformation was due, and was made; but the right reformation was the reformation wrought by the Council of Trent, and not by Luther and Calvin. To justify their claims, they had to contend that the Church of Christ had failed; and that they were to found an institution organically distinct from that which had been before. But Christ promised that his Church could not fail. Christ's promise makes it necessary that at every point of time in the world's history since his time, we should see an organization having an organic identity with the original organization built on Peter. And there is only one institution that dares lay claim to an identity with the original apostolic Church, and that institution is the Roman Catholic Church. She defies the world to show where her organic unity was broken; she defies the world to show where the gates of Hades corrupted her doctrines. Some of her children committed treason against her, and betrayed her cause; she has had her dark days; but she has always been faithful to her mission. In seeking to know the Catholic Church, men erroneously confound the deeds of Catholics with the institution of Christ. The Church of Christ is responsible for her system of doctrines, for her code of morals, and for the existence in the world of certain institutions warranted by the living constitution of the Church. Let men study these, and they will find them absolutely perfect. They will find that whenever Catholics have done wrong, it was because they did not square their lives with the principles of the Catholic Church.

The Catholic Church has a most difficult mission to fulfill. She is hated by the world; and yet she must exist in the world, and work among men who naturally love the world. She can make no compromises; she has no new doctrines to tickle the ears of a prurient, unbelieving generation. She can not put

away the doctrine of hell, because it is unpopular; she can not substitute the themes of fashion and the fads of the day for the preaching of Christ crucified; she calls men to walk in the narrow and difficult road by mortification and renunciation; her doctrines are not the inventions of the minds of men, but the message of Christ which an apostolic body of teachers is commissioned to teach till the end of time. She teaches with authority like the prophets of old, because she is sure of her message, and of her commission. In her battle with the gates of Hades she will suffer, but she cannot succumb. The first principle of the Christian religion is the veracity of Christ's words. Now Christ has pledged himself to keep forever in the world the identical apostolic Church, the Church that was built upon Peter. Does any of the modern sects dare to claim an identity with the Church of the Apostles? The Catholic Church alone puts forth that claim, and no man dares to question it. She can trace the unbroken unity of doctrine, the unbroken apostolic succession, the unbroken allegiance of the faithful to the vicars of Christ. The so-called reformers say that the Church of Christ grew corrupt and failed. Christ says that his Church can not fail. Whom shall we believe? They appeal to the testimonies of history that there was corruption in the head and members of the Church. We grant the fact, and deny the inference. The bad members were as a disease in the Church's blood, but she did not die of this disease, for she could not die. Her powers were somewhat weakened by this disease; but she cast off the diseased elements by the power of her divine vigor, and re-invigorated she kept on in her mission; and to-day she stands forth gloriously the city on the hill, so that all men can find her, and have life through her. She is the only unchanging thing in this world of change and decay. She has withstood attacks that nothing but the power of God could withstand.

The gates of Hades did not always attack her in the same way. At one time the attack was by bloody persecution, at another it was by heresy and schism; again it was by the seductive influence of worldliness, or by unjust legislation of the State; and even the personal tribulations and temptations of the Church's members may be reckoned among the agencies

by which the gates of Hades strive to overthrow the Church of God.

The spirit of the world is the devil's close ally; and the spirit of the world is Protean in character. There are open forces and silent forces always working against the Church. By nature man is a child of this world, and goes with the world. Everything round about him invites him to naturalism. The thought of the age is sunk in naturalism; the energy of the human race moves in the groove of naturalism. Even that which outside of the Catholic Church goes by the name of religion is mere naturalism. It occupies itself with respectability and good manners in society. It is a religion that is not religious. The supernatural is nowhere discoverable in it. A sort of refined paganism has fastened itself upon our people. Instead of holding themselves pilgrims who have here no abiding city, men settle down with the most absolute attachment to their pursuits and their pleasures. The gloom of the thought of death is not relieved by the hope of Heaven. Heaven is a dull, cold word.

Now amid such surroundings the Church must work out her mission. Naturally enough she will not have the popular favor of the world; neither will she have the majority of mortals within her fold; she offers salvation to all, and she saves those who have broken with the world, and who have put on Jesus Christ.

We have given thus far no notice to the modern opinion which interprets the expression "the gates of Hades" to mean the power of death. This opinion has obtained the endorsement of Schegg, Bisping, Schanz, Fillion, Keil, Weiss, and Mansel. These believe that Christ by these words promised the Church perpetual life, for the reason that death would have no power over her. They argue that Hades is used in Scripture as a poetic representation of death. This we grant; but we also insist that there are passages in the New Testament where it is clearly distinguished from death. For instance, in the Apocalypse of John I. 18, the Lord says to John: "*Καὶ ἔχω τὰς κλεῖδας τοῦ θανάτου καὶ τοῦ ᾗδου, I have the keys of death and of Hades.*" Again in the sixth chapter of the Apocalypse, the eighth verse we read: "*Καὶ ἰδοὺ ἵππος χλωρός,*

καὶ ὁ καθήμενος ἐπάνω αὐτοῦ, ὄνομα αὐτῷ ὁ θάνατος, καὶ ὁ ἄδης ἠκολούθει μετ' αὐτοῦ: *and behold, a pale horse: and he that sat upon him, his name was Death; and Hades followed with him.*"

And again in the twentieth chapter of St. John's Apocalypse, fourteenth verse: "Καὶ ὁ θάνατος καὶ ὁ ἄδης ἐβλήθησαν εἰς τὴν λίμνην τοῦ πυρός: *and Death and Hades were cast into the lake of fire.*"

The personification of Death and Hades as two distinct individuals is clear evidence that in the language of the New Testament, Hades is distinct from death. Hades is the kingdom of the infernal world, over which Satan presides. Death is Satan's ally, for by sin death came into creation. Hence we see how natural and forcible is the figure to represent the entire power of Satan as the gates of Hades.

A legitimate conclusion from this promise of Christ is that the Church is infallible. The Church was founded for a specific object, and she must attain that object. Her object is to teach men the truth, and apply to men the fruit of Christ's Redemption till the end of time. Now in many departments of human science men are content with a degree of probability, but in religion men must have a certainty. Christ founded the Church to deliver to men an authoritative message, and to exact from them the obedience of faith. As this is the great power of the Church, the gates of Hades would naturally make the chief attack to destroy this great power by corrupting the Church's teachings. Satan has indeed waged a bitter warfare on this ground, and has led some of the children of the Church into apostasy; but he could not prevail against the institution, because Christ's promise upheld it. A teaching organization, that does not teach with authority is a farce, and a deception; and in order to teach with authority the organization must be infallible. In the Old Law the prophets taught with authority, because they could say: "Thus saith the Lord." The Church can not fulfill her mission unless she can also say: "Thus saith the Lord." And she does say this, because the Spirit of truth abides with her always to teach her all truth even to the end of time.

Although we shall have other clearer texts for the infallibility of the Pope, yet even here it is evident as a direct con-

sequence of his relation to the Church. Christ founded the Church as an organization which should find its stability in its supreme president. Now to be a supreme president of such an organization, the Pope must at times act as the supreme arbiter under God of the Church's acts. And it would be an anomaly that the organization should be infallible and yet be subject to the authority of a fallible supreme president. The Church has the power to bind men's faith, and the Church must act through some central authority, one and supreme under God on earth.

In building his Church, the Lord has acted after the manner of the "wise man who built his house upon a rock; the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell not: for it was founded upon the rock."—Matt. VII. 24-25.

It was not the personal qualities of Peter, nor the personal qualities of his successors that gave to the Church the stability of the bed-rock. It was a definite form of authority through which the power of Christ worked. Christ simply established an everlasting line of human representatives of his own divine authority, and through them his power upholds the Church, and gives to it its attributes of infallibility and indefectibility. This is conformable to the method that God has always employed in dealing with the world. He dealt with the world in the Old Law through a definite organization of his own institution, and he has clearly established a center of authority in the New Law, to which he has given greater power, inasmuch as it must operate in a higher and better covenant.

We next proceed to the analysis of the second part of Christ's declaration: "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of Heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in Heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in Heaven."

The "kingdom of Heaven" is an expression only found in Matthew. It occurs in his Gospel thirty-four times. It corresponds to that which the other Evangelists call the kingdom of God. At times the terms kingdom of Heaven, or kingdom of God, signify the universality of God's elect, with all the elements that go to make up that world. At other times the

terms are used to express some of the elements of this grand whole, such as the element of power and authority, or the element of Christ's doctrine, or the people on earth who belong to Christ's covenant.

It is evident that the kingdom of Heaven, as here used, means the organization of the Church of Christ. This is self-evident. It had been predicted by Daniel that in the days of the Messiah, God should set up a kingdom: "And in the days of these kings shall the God of Heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed, nor shall the sovereignty thereof be left to another people; but it shall break in pieces, and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever."—Dan. II. 44. Christ himself asserted that he was a king, and he established only one institution on earth, and that is his Church. Now as Peter's power must be exercised on earth, it follows that the kingdom of which he has the keys can be no other than the militant Church. Christ had spoken of his institution under the metaphor of a building; he continues the same figure by committing to Peter the keys of such building.

In Scriptural language, to give one the keys signifies to confer upon one a power supreme in its order. This is clearly evidenced from the famous passage of Isaiah, XXII. 15-22: "Thus saith the Lord, the Lord of hosts: Go get thee unto this treasurer, even unto Shebna, who is over the house, and say: What doest thou here? and whom has thou here, that thou hast hewed thee out here a sepulchre? hewing him out a sepulchre on high, graving an habitation for himself in the rock? Behold, the Lord will hurl thee away violently as a strong man; yea, he will wrap thee up closely. He will surely turn and toss thee like a ball into a large country; there shalt thou die, and there shall be the chariots of thy glory, thou shame of thy lord's house. And I will thrust thee from thine office, and from thy station shall he pull thee down. And it shall come to pass in that day, that I call my servant Eliakim the son of Hilkiah: and I will clothe him with thy robe, and strengthen him with thy girdle, and I will commit thy government into his hand: and he shall be a father to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and to the house of Judah. And the key of the

house of David will I lay upon his shoulder; and he shall open and none shall shut; and he shall shut, and none shall open."

The keys were thus suspended from the shoulder as a symbol of supreme authority. Such use of language is also found among other Oriental nations. When the legates of Francis I. went to treat with the victorious Soliman, the haughty Turk declared to them that "he would suspend the keys of Hungary from his shoulder."

The same metaphor is used in Isaiah, IX. 6: "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulder." By this there is attributed to the Messiah a supreme power over the universe.

Again, in the Apocalypse of St. John I. 28, we read: "I am the First and the Last, and the Living One; and I was dead, and behold, I am alive for evermore, and I have the keys of Death and of Hades." And in the same Apocalypse, III. 7, it is written: "And to the angel of the Church in Philadelphia write: These things saith he that is holy, he that is true, he that hath the key of David, he that openeth, and none shall shut, and that shutteth, and none openeth."

The metaphor arose from the fact that in Oriental life it was customary to assign to a steward the administration of a house. He bore the keys, and to him the supreme command was given under the lord of the house. The metaphor was thence extended to signify the supreme power over a kingdom, and even over the universe itself.

Very aptly Christ joins this metaphor to the preceding. He has spoken of his Church under the figure of a house that he would build on Peter. Christ is the supreme Lord of that house, and he appoints Peter the supreme administrator under himself, and he gives him the keys of the house, thereby transferring to him the supreme administration of that house which is the Church of Christ.

Of course, there is some mixing of metaphors here, by which he who is the foundation of the house is made the keeper of its keys; but such use of metaphors is common in Scripture. Some flexibility of mind is needed to follow the thought as it flashes forth, now in one figure, and now in another.

As the Apocalypse says, III. 7, "Christ has the key of David," that is to say, the key of the throne of David. By the throne of David, as here used, there is evidently meant the Church of Christ, of which David's temporal throne was a type. Hence Christ has the absolute supreme command in the Church. Peter is his vicar, his supreme administrator, to whom he has given a supreme vicarious power. Christ has not abdicated his own power; he is in the Church, and actively gives it its life and its energy, but he needs a human representative, because his Church is an organization of men. Peter is that representative, and the office of Peter never dies. Christ is with Peter; and Peter can not fail, because Christ is with him.

It is evident that the propositions, "And whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in Heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in Heaven," refer not to any physical effect, but to a moral binding and loosing. The propositions are universal, and comprehend every entity whose nature permits it to be subject to the supreme vicarious power conferred on Peter. This power is as extensive as the power of the Church itself.

The binding and the loosing are predicated of Peter in virtue of his possession of the keys. Hence the binding and the loosing must be an effect of the power emblemized by the keys. Now we have seen that the keys emblemize a supreme vicarious jurisdiction and authority over the entire organization of the Church. Wherefore in these words Christ, the supreme head of the Church, declares that he will ratify the acts of his supreme vicar. The acts of Peter acting in his character as vicar of Christ, are ratified by Christ, and are subject to no other power but that of Christ. Now it would be absurd to confer on any mortal man such a power, without, at the same time, making provision that the human agent might not abuse such a large power. Christ is responsible for the acts of Peter, inasmuch as he has here declared that Peter's acts are ratified in Heaven. Such an endorsement could not be given to the acts of a fallible man.

The power of binding and of loosing comprises the power of binding men's faith by proposing to them the law of belief; it comprises the power of making laws to govern the Church; it

comprises the power of absolving from sin through the sacraments of the Church; it comprises the power of dispensing from the laws of the Church, the power of judging, and the power of punishing.

That Peter should so exercise his office that Christ ratify his acts, it is necessary that the law of faith and morals should be an infallible one, and hence to enable Peter to fulfill adequately this office, infallibility is given him. In the other relations where infallibility is not requisite, there is a certain special protecting influence exercised over the office of the Supreme President of the Church, and all men are called to obey him as the supreme vicarious law-giver of the Church. Wherefore the Pope has power to bind men's consciences in matters that are not of faith. For instance, if the Pope should decree that a certain day should be kept holy, or that it should be a day of fasting, that decree would be ratified in Heaven, and it would bind men's consciences.

The office of Peter is the supreme tribunal on earth; in its proper sphere of action it is subject to no other power, save that of God alone. The fullness of power is given to Peter by the giving of the keys, and the authority of his acts is established by the solemn assertion that these acts will be ratified in Heaven. No created being has power to nullify or set aside the official acts of the Supreme President of Christ's Church.

It is a great power to confer upon a man; but, as we have said before, Christ in giving this power, safeguarded the agent so that he could rightly exercise that high power.

The passage under consideration is like to the passage in the Apocalypse, III. 7: "*—he that hath the keys of David, he that openeth, and none shall shut, and he that shutteth and none openeth*" There is certainly here predicated by that figure the sovereignty of the Messiah's power over the new kingdom of David. The opening and the shutting relate to the exercise of a supreme power.

In like manner also, the same expression applied by Christ to Peter relates to the exercise of a supreme vicarious power, which Peter should exercise in the Church, which was to be built on him.

The propositions: "—whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in Heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in Heaven," explain the nature and extent of the power conferred by the giving of the keys to Peter. Peter is given the keys of a kingdom, by which metaphor he is appointed Christ's supreme vicar over that same kingdom, of which, as it is written in the Apocalypse, III. 7, Christ has the keys. Christ makes Peter supreme under himself, and gives to him the vicarious exercise of Christ's own absolute power.

We shall not give notice to the absurd contention of some protestants who assert that in these solemn words Christ meant no more than that Peter should be the leader in preaching the Gospel. It is not becoming to waste time in refuting such absurdities.

The present passage is far more comprehensive than the passage of John XX. 23: "Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whosesoever sins ye forgive, they are forgiven unto them; and whosoever sins ye shall retain, they are retained." By this commission the power of forgiving sins is given to the Church to be exercised by her priests; and as Peter is supreme president of that Church, of course, his power is supreme also in the power of forgiving. But the Roman pontiff's power is far more comprehensive than this. It is the supreme center of all law in the Church, and embraces everything pertaining to the right government of the Church.

A difficulty arises from a comparison between the present text and Matthew, XVIII. 18, but of this difficulty we shall treat in our exposition of the latter text.

In receiving from Christ the keys of the kingdom of Heaven, Peter acted in a representative character. In the first place, he represented the whole future line of his successors to whom through him the same power is transmitted. Secondly, he represented the Church, not by a delegation of the other Apostles, but as the juridical head of the Church, by Christ's own appointment. Wherefore the Church receives through her head these ample powers given her through Peter. The great power is given to Peter precisely as head of the Church.

A more complete analysis of the relations that existed between Peter's office and authority and the office and authority of the other Apostles will be made in the exposition of Matthew XVIII. 18. Suffice it here to say that upon Peter as the individual head of the Church is conferred all the power of the Church, and in the Church. And this power is given to Peter as one individual supreme head of the Church. It would be erroneous to say that the supreme vicarious power comes to Peter from the fact that he is an integral part of a society in which society such supreme power is vested. The society depends on Peter its foundation-rock, but Peter is not dependent on the society to receive his power. This results from a fair consideration of Christ's words. He made Peter the foundation, and the foundation stands alone, and gives stability to the edifice. He gave him the keys of the kingdom; and he who has the keys of the kingdom is supreme over those of the kingdom.

But the power given to the whole body of Apostles always contemplates them as forming with Peter their head, one body, representing the Church united to its head. As such they have all the power conferred on Peter, but they have this precisely because they are united to their head. As individual Apostles they received the power of forgiving sins, the power of infallibility when teaching the doctrines of Christ, and an authoritative commission; but individually considered, no other Apostle was made equal to Peter. The organic unity of the body demanded that there should be one head, and through this head the fullest power comes from Christ to the Church.

Now whatever is predicated of Peter as the head of the Church, must be equally true of his successors, for Christ built a Church that was to last till the end of time. The constitution and form of regimen that he gave her must be the same to-day, for she can not fail.

Both the promise of Christ given to the body of the Apostles, and the promise of Christ to Peter as head of the Church contemplate the beings to whom the promises were given as existing forever, and as forever using the power by Christ conveyed to them. The Apostles are perpetuated in the unfailing succession of the bishops; Peter is perpetuated

in the unbroken line of the Roman pontiffs. The bishops united to their head, as in a general council, are infallible when they formally promulgate doctrines of faith or morals; St. Peter's successors themselves when they teach in the same manner, teach infallibly. The personal infallibility of the individual Apostles passed not to the individual bishops. The power of infallibility and the *charisma* of inspiration were conferred on many in the beginning in order to found the Church. But Christ made permanent in the Church the office and power of Peter. He alone of the Apostles has one and one only definite certain successor to whom his powers pass. Even from a human viewpoint no system can be conceived more apt to do the Church's work than the one which the Catholic faith teaches.

Our exposition of this text is conformable to the consensus of the Fathers of the Catholic Church, so that it would be superfluous to cite here their numerous testimonies.

After the rise of the sects of the Montanists and Novatians, some of the Fathers argued against them that the powers given to Peter were not given to him as an individual, but as a part of the Church. But an inspection of the issue then pending will readily explain this. The forementioned heretics denied to the Church the power to forgive certain sins. And they disposed of the present text by saying that such power was only a personal prerogative of Peter. Against them the Fathers contended that the powers of Peter were given him not as a private individual, but as the head of the Church; that they did not die with him, but are in the Church forever. There may at times be found an obscure sentence of some Father respecting the powers of the successors of Peter, but the great trend of tradition is that Peter is the Supreme Head of the Church; and that Peter lives in his successors; and that his great powers are vested in the unbroken line of his successors in the see of Rome.

Against this doctrine men have objected that it would be rash to confer on a man such high power. They allege also the personal character of some of the pontiffs as proof that God would not delegate to such men the plenitude of power here described. This argument would have some force in the

supposition that Christ made the Roman Pontiffs independent of Christ himself. But it is not thus: Christ abides with the Church; he gives her supreme visible head only a supreme vicarious power; and Christ controls his vicar by absolute power. Christ may allow a sinful man to exercise that power, as he allowed Judas to be one of the Twelve; but Christ never abandons the Church to the danger of spiritual loss through the sin of her human head. Christ has conferred a great power, but he has so safeguarded it that its exercise can not miscarry. It is given in a manner that the Pontiff can not abuse it. And history confirms this, for infallibility has never been abused. The pontiffs have abused their political power, and at times their disciplinary power; but they have never made a perverse use of the high prerogative here conferred on St. Peter and his successors.

END OF SECOND VOLUME.

3 5282 00167 0309

graduate

DATE DUE			
NO 19 '81			

BS2555
B65
1908x
vol. 2

STACKS BS2555.B65 1908x vol. 2

Breen, A. E.

A harmonized exposition of the four Gosp



3 5282 00167 0309